

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7020. A bill amending Public Law No. 100, Seventy-seventh Congress (approved June 3, 1941); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAGAN:

H. R. 7028. A bill to amend section 31, as amended, of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 476. Resolution authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the petroleum requirements of the United States Navy on the east coast of the United States and the sources of supply and methods of transportation of petroleum and petroleum products for the east coast; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 477. Resolution to provide for expenses of study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 476; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 478. Resolution that the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Naval Affairs not to exceed \$50,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee conducting such studies and investigations or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 7021. A bill for the relief of Homer H. Keffer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 7022. A bill for the relief of Jane Thayer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7023. A bill for the relief of George A. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7024. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lee Hauser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 7025. A bill to make Younghill Kaug eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 7026. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of California over certain naturalization proceedings in the case of John Charles Thorn; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 7027. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2738. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of R. L. Valentine and sundry other citizens of St. Ansgar, Iowa, and vicinity, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2739. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Clear Lake, Iowa, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2740. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Barbers Union, Local No. 148, San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, to increase

the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2741. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Union Label Trades Department of the State of New York, opposing any proposed legislation tending to again bring out prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1942

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend Ze-Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art our eternal life, live Thou in us that we may live not in the narrowness of self-content, but in the breadth of sympathy and understanding that will quicken in others the wholesome and beneficent determination to live above the cares that drag men down. Cleanse Thou the heart of this Nation, that we may assimilate from the divers elements of life's changing scenes, something of rare use and beauty that will sanctify the common tasks of every day's most quiet need.

Come Thou as true, unerring wisdom to all who need guidance in thought and action, especially to Thy servants here assembled; come as an inspiring faith to all who walk in darkness or uncertainty; come as a supporting strength to those with burdens heavy and grievous to be borne, and if there be any such as have not sought Thine aid, save them from the blight of the unasking and unkneeling soul, for the sake of Him who hath showed us how to love and hath taught us how to pray, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, April 28, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 28, 1942:

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson;

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S. 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree;

S. 1619. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of John Snure, Jr.;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S. Hathaway;

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the District of New Jersey;

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro;

S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes;

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Tom G. Irving, Thomas G. Irving, Sr., J. E. Irving, Mata D. Irving, L. T. Dale, and Amelia Dale;

S. 2212. An act to suspend during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

On April 29, 1942:

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer; and

S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2315) for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the Vice President in signing the enrolled bill (S. 2202) to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army is hereby rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That the action of the Senate and the House of Representatives in passing the said bill is hereby vacated.

The message further announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1563) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5295) for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WEISS, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5845) for the relief of Alvira Manfredi; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. PITTENGER were ap-

pointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 809. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr.;

H. R. 5596. An act for the relief of Tommy Huddleston; and

H. R. 6604. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4869) to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1765. An act for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, deceased;

S. 2002. An act to amend Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941;

H. R. 736. An act for the relief of Ideal Service Station;

H. R. 1154. An act for the relief of George C. Dewey;

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 3476. An act for the relief of James A. Quillinan;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Edward Keating and others;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett;

H. R. 4408. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett;

H. R. 4413. An act for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky;

H. R. 4869. An act to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4981. An act for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates, a partnership;

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the guardian of Charles Jirinec, an infant;

H. R. 5857. An act for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of Howard L. Miller;

H. R. 5962. An act to ratify and confirm Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 6020. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous)

of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; H. R. 6063. An act for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co.;

H. R. 6166. An act to approve Act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board;

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;

H. R. 6604. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to personnel of the land forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual report of the Archivist for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Library.

TRAVEL FROM MILITARY ZONES OF DEPENDENTS OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of appropriations for travel and transportation for the transportation of dependents of officers and employees of Government agencies from zones of military operations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURTON:

The petitions of Grace L. Mosher and other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ashtabula; of Mrs. Elmer Shank and sundry other citizens of Miami County; and of John C. Campbell and sundry other members of the Uniontown Parent-Teachers Association, Belmont County, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Topeka and Overland Park, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance.

"STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,

"IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
"January Session, A. D. 1942.
"Resolution 146

"Memorializing Congress of the United States of America to defeat proposed legislation to increase the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes

"Whereas the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington is considering the 1942 revenue bill as submitted by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau; and

"Whereas in said revenue bill an increase in the Federal gasoline tax from 1½ cents to 3 cents per gallon, which is a 100-percent tax increase over the present levy, has been proposed; and

"Whereas an increase in the Federal lubricating-oil tax from 4½ cents to 10 cents per gallon, which is a 144-percent tax increase over the present levy, has also been proposed; and

"Whereas in addition to the above-proposed Federal taxes there now exists in the State of Rhode Island a tax on gasoline of 3 cents per gallon; and

"Whereas gasoline and lubricating oil are acknowledged necessities to businessmen, farmers, defense workers, and, in fact, to all persons engaged in the pursuit of a legitimate livelihood, and should not be singled out for special taxation along with luxuries and nonessential commodities: Be it therefore

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to defeat such proposed legislation to increase the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of Rhode Island, and that the latter be urged to use their best offices to prevent the enactment of any legislation which will increase the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes."

LABOR AND THE WAR EFFORT—PETITION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto, and appropriately referred a petition regarding labor and the conduct of the war, signed by Mr. E. H. Pugh and 93 other citizens of Independence, Kans.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned taxpayers, citizens of the United States, your constituents, demand that: Legislation be enacted to abolish the union closed shop for the duration of the war, permitting any qualified American citizen to work on defense work without paying tribute to labor-union racketeers. Also that industry having defense contracts be required to operate 24 hours per day on a 7-day week, and that waste and graft be eliminated from all war effort, both National and State, also that time and one-half and double time be eliminated, with 6-percent profit to industry maximum allowed.

E. H. PUGH,

FRED C. SANDERS,

(And sundry other citizens of Independence, Kans.)

PRIORITIES AND PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS— PETITION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also present and ask to have printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto, and appropriately referred a petition regarding priorities and Senate bill 860, signed by Mrs. Nellie W. Bender and 79 other citizens of Holton, Kans.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens of Jackson County, Kans., hereby petition our legal Representatives in Congress to use their influence to change the order of classification and priorities which prohibits owners of trucks used for the delivery of milk and other food products from buying tires, thereby compelling discontinuance of these deliveries of essential foods and permits persons and corporations owning and operating trucks delivering beer and other alcoholic beverages to buy tires in order to continue deliveries and operations. We further petition that during this national emergency all manufacturing and distribution of alcoholic beverages be denied all priority rights.

We also petition the passage of Senate bill 860.

Mrs. RATIA KLUSHMIRE,
H. B. LYONS,
(And sundry other citizens of Holton, Kans.)

EFFICIENCY OF VOLUNTARY HOSPITALS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have in my hand some correspondence from the Secretary of the Western New York Hospital Council, which I shall ask to have made part of my remarks in the RECORD, and that it be brought to the attention of the committee of the Senate having to do with legislation affecting our hospitals. This correspondence includes some resolutions adopted by the American Hospital Association, resolutions having to do with the voluntary hospitals of the United States, hospitals which account for more than 60 percent of all hospital admissions in our country.

I wish to pay my respects to the American Hospital Association and also to the voluntary hospitals of the United States for the splendid work they are doing in furthering the national defense effort at this time. Like all our hospitals, like the medical and the nursing professions, they are rendering valiant services to the country.

I want this correspondence made part of my remarks, and I should like to have it brought to the attention of the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the correspondence and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN NEW YORK HOSPITAL COUNCIL,
March 14, 1942.

HON. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEAD: We are handing you, attached, copy of letter written to Bert W. Caldwell, executive secretary of the American Hospital Association, Chicago, Ill.; also copy of the resolutions of the American Hospital Association of February 14, 1942.

The hospitals composing this council feel confident that this matter so vitally affecting

the voluntary hospital system will receive very earnest consideration at the hands of their Congressmen.

Very sincerely yours,
WESTERN NEW YORK HOSPITAL COUNCIL,
ALICE J. MACK, Secretary.

WESTERN NEW YORK HOSPITAL COUNCIL,
March 14, 1942.

BERT W. CALDWELL, M. D.,
Executive Secretary,
American Hospital Association,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. CALDWELL: Referring to the Social Security Board's plans for the partial payment of the hospitalization of beneficiaries, at the rate of \$3 per day cash:

At a special meeting of the Western New York Hospital Council, held at the Buffalo General Hospital, Buffalo, N. Y., March 11, 1942, action was taken—

"That this council approves the resolutions of the American Hospital Association of February 14, 1942; and

"That a letter be written to the secretary of the American Hospital Association, voicing this approval; and also, that a copy of that letter, with a copy of the American Hospital Association's resolutions, be sent to our Congressmen in this area."

Very sincerely yours,
WESTERN NEW YORK HOSPITAL COUNCIL,
ALICE J. MACK, Secretary.

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1942.

Resolved, That the voluntary hospitals of the United States, which account for more than 60 percent of all hospital admissions, are a national asset of incalculable value.

That the efficiency of these institutions is traceable in large part to their freedom of action under local control.

That the independence of voluntary hospitals and of hospitals under city, county, and other local community control should not be jeopardized by Federal legislation.

That programs seeking to widen the use of voluntary hospitals, and their more perfect adaptation to the needs of the workers of the country through voluntary contributory plans, merit Government consideration and support.

That a full opportunity should be given to the voluntary hospitals of the country, through the American Hospital Association, to study proposed legislation affecting hospitals before such legislation is offered to the Congress.

Resolved, That these resolutions be brought to the notice of the President of the United States, the Social Security Board, and the Members of the Congress of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6802. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes (this bill had been re-committed) with amendments (Rept. No. 1292).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2037. A bill for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1298);

S. 2279. A bill for the relief of O. R. Maxfield; with amendments (Rept. No. 1286);

S. 2318. A bill for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288);

S. 2354. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289);

H. R. 5000. A bill for the relief of Ferd W. Melle; with amendments (Rept. No. 1287);

H. R. 5275. A bill for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1290); and

H. R. 5658. A bill for the relief of James Warren; without amendment (Rept. No. 1291).

By Mr. ROSIER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Floyd Odom; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293);

H. R. 4153. A bill for the relief of Cleaver Kelley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1296);

H. R. 4723. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1297);

H. R. 5468. A bill for the relief of J. Furman Richardson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1294); and

H. R. 5563. A bill for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford; without amendment (Rept. No. 1295).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2319. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California in order to fill a vacancy in the office of an additional district judge heretofore authorized for such district; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 27, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 836. An act for the relief of John C. Crossman;

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson;

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S. 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree;

S. 1619. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of John Snure, Jr.;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S. Hathaway;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey;

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro;

S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes;

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias;

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Tom G. Irving; Thomas G. Irving, Sr.; J. E. Irving; Mata D. Irving; L. T. Dale; and Amelia Dale;

S. 2212. An act to suspend during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases;

S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2492. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2493. A bill to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 2494. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of Raleigh Edward Hughes as a lieutenant, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 2495. A bill extending the maturity date of loans made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton, corn, and wheat of the 1941 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2496. A bill to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2497. A bill to amend Public Law 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 199, second session, title III, priorities powers, section 2, subsection 2 (C); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 2498. A bill relating to the payment of 6 months' pay to a dependent relative of an officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army when the designated beneficiary dies prior to the death of such officer or enlisted man without another beneficiary having been designated; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2499. A bill to amend Title II of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 and the Fire and Casualty Act;

S. 2500. A bill relating to the assessment of tangible personal property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2501. A bill to authorize the Assessor of the District of Columbia to compromise inheritance and estate taxes in cases of conflicting claims of domicile;

S. 2502. A bill relating to the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; and

S. 2503. A bill to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUDIT OF ACCOUNT FOUND DUE THE CHEROKEE SCHOOL FUND

Mr. LEE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 240), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Comptroller General of the United States is requested to audit the account found due the Cherokee school fund as stated in the first item of the account rendered by the United States (Slade-Bender) on April 28, 1894 (House of Representatives Executive Document No. 182, 53d Cong.), and to readjust the same in accordance with the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, dated December 2, 1895, as set

forth in Senate Document No. 16, Fifty-fourth Congress; and, after crediting the United States with the amount appropriated thereon June 30, 1906, to report the balance, if any, then remaining due and unpaid.

INCREASED USE OF INLAND WATERWAYS FOR TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 241), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of means by which the inland waterways of the United States may be more fully utilized, with a particular view toward providing for increasing the use of existing waterways for the transportation of petroleum products and other articles and commodities. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigation, with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANDENBERG ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE AND ADDRESS TO THE COUNTRY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the full statement which I issued following the President's recent message to Congress and his recent address to the country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At long last we are on our way toward being effective to the end that we do not lose the economic war at home before we have a chance to win the military war abroad. But we cannot rely upon wishful thinking at any stage of the game. We now have reasonably complete price ceilings by law. We shall soon have totally effective profits ceilings by law. The third vital factor still demands kindred attention. We must have wage ceilings by law—with reasonable provisions for correcting maladjustments. The chain will never be any stronger than its weakest link. Labor has infinitely more to gain from total success for this program than from any exemption which destroys it. Agriculture will not resist parity when it sees that parity is the mandatory rule for all. The President is eternally right when he says that all seven points in his program are indispensable to each other. But I believe he is wrong to leave any part of the achievement to chance. There must be no hole in the dike. I fear he is wrong in still avoiding compulsory savings for War-Bond purposes, but the country can prove him right by stepping up its voluntary purchases, although even the Treasury's announced aims in this connection are only

about one-third of its necessities. I know the President is wrong in not adding an eighth point—maximum nondefense economies in the operation of Government and the demobilization of useless, overlapping, and often socialistic bureaucracy. But he is everlastingly sound when he relies upon the total cooperation of the American people to win this war whenever they have total information as to what is required of them.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF CONSTITUTION DAY OF POLAND—JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR BROWN AND SENATOR SMATHERS

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement issued by him and Senator Brown on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the Constitution Day of the Republic of Poland, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SEVEN-POINT PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Seven-Point Program," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of April 30, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, yesterday the President issued a proclamation designating May 22 for the tenth annual observance of National Maritime Day. This is the first time the observance of this day finds our Nation at war, and it is fitting that the people of the Nation should join in paying tribute to the heroic men of the merchant marine and those stout hearts who are laboring unstintedly in the Nation's shipyards to build merchant vessels which are essential to ultimate victory against our enemies.

I wish, Mr. President, to take just a minute or two to pay tribute to our seamen. In 1938, upon the death of the former chairman of the Committee on Commerce, my honored friend, Senator Copeland, I became chairman of the committee to investigate conditions in the maritime industry. There was at that time a great deal of rumor and discussion tending to bring seamen into more or less disrepute on account of subversive influences. I think the facts of our experience in the last 6 months tend fully to allay those rumors. If there are subversive influences in the maritime industry amongst the seamen, they certainly have not appeared in this time of stress and trial. The seamen have gone down to the seas in their ships; they have been under fire on our coasts; they have conducted themselves in a manner worthy of the highest traditions of American patriotism. I have heard nothing of difficulty and nothing of complaint from them or those who love them; on the other hand, I bear witness to the fact that they are carrying on magnificently under fire, night and day.

In this connection I wish to call attention to some other facts. There is justifiable alarm in our country as to our progress in building ships. All of us realize the importance of transportation across the seas, and we know the size of our program. Some complaint is heard because we are not launching ships at the rate of three a day; but it takes 4 months to build a 10,000-ton deadweight

ship, and if we lay keels at the rate of one a day, which we will soon be doing, we can entertain the hope of producing ships and placing them in commission in 120 days, and at the end of, say, 4 or 5 months, we can test this production much more soundly than we can now do.

Meanwhile, let me say, there are 2,000,000 American citizens engaged in the production of merchant ships and materials and fittings to go into them. They are at work; they are doing their jobs. They are being pretty well paid; but, it is my judgment, that they are entitled to be pretty well paid. After all, their incomes will not be much greater than the average, and they are doing an indispensable work. More than 500 industrial plants throughout our Nation are working with the 60 shipyards to produce these vessels. More than 50,000 sailors are manning the merchant ships and are facing the constant menace of enemy submarines and bombers, so that this great arsenal of the democracies may, through the life line of shipping, provide the sinews of war to the United Nations on every world-wide front and the means of carrying on to our own men of the armed forces.

Let me say one other word. I had to deal with the Maritime Commission for many years; indeed, since its foundation, since 1937, I have dealt quite intimately and almost constantly with the Commission and with its head, Admiral Land, who is also the Shipping Administrator.

There is a tendency to complain; and I would not find fault with that. There is a great deal more to hearten us than there is to dishearten us. There is a great deal more to praise than to blame. I do not think it would be worthy of me if I should not say that in these 5 years of tireless and indefatigable and highly intelligent effort Admiral Land has completely won my confidence. I do not know of a more unselfish, a more devoted, or an abler public servant than Admiral Land; and I could pay a similar compliment to his colleagues. I think that, all things considered, we are doing pretty well, and I do not think that any activity of our war effort is being handled in a better way than the shipping activity, under the leadership of Admiral Land.

Mr. President, I ask that proclamation of the President to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY, 1942

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas on May 22, 1819, the steamship *The Savannah* sailed from Savannah, Ga., on the first successful transoceanic voyage under steam propulsion, thus making a material contribution to the advancement of ocean transportation; and

Whereas the Congress by joint resolution approved May 20, 1933 (48 Stat. 73), designated May 22 of each year as National Maritime Day and requested the President to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such National Maritime Day; and

Whereas we of the United Nations are engaged in a war for the preservation of our liberties against the powers of aggression; and

Whereas it is fitting that public recognition be given to the patriotism and courage of the officers and men of the cargo ships in the victory fleet, and to the men in the shipyards and factories whose labor and genius go into their construction:

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to observe May 22, 1942, as National Maritime Day by displaying the flag at their homes or other suitable places and do direct that the flag be displayed on all Government buildings on that day.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this 27th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1942, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-sixth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President:

CORDELL HULL,

Secretary of State.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of our Committee on Commerce, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and to say to him that the high compliment he has paid to the Maritime Commission, to the shipping industry, and to American seamen for their heroism is but another evidence of his splendid interest in the work of his committee. The committee over which he presides has taken cognizance of this splendid work, and the proposed legislation which has been favorably acted upon by our committee, some of the measures having for their purpose the granting of rewards to the heroes of the American merchant marine, is further evidence of our interest in this all-important question, and the careful consideration it is receiving under the leadership of our chairman.

THE SENATE "COW BLOC"

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as half of the Senate "cow bloc," I want to discuss very briefly the misfortunes that have overtaken the other 50 percent of the "cow bloc," namely, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. These misfortunes are concisely described in a story written by the Washington correspondent of the Topeka Capital, a daily newspaper owned by my colleague the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], which was reprinted in my own newspaper, the Parsons Sun, at Parsons, Kans., and which reads:

BOVINE STORK PLAYS MEAN TRICK ON SOLON

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The United States Senate in its time has had a number of "blocs." One of the latest is the "cow bloc," composed of Senator CLYDE M. REED, of Kansas, and Senator RUFUS C. HOLMAN, of Oregon. They both brag about their Guernsey herds.

But hard luck has camped on the Holman doorstep, perhaps one should say in the Holman cowsheds. When Senator HOLMAN comes into the Senate with a particularly long face colleagues in the know put on long faces themselves and ask in hushed voices:

"Is it another one, Rufus?"

And Senator HOLMAN responds sorrowfully:

"It is."

The Holman Guernsey herd numbers thirty-some cows. And in succession these cows have produced offspring—19 in a row, count 'em, 19 bull calves.

A dairyman can appreciate this, if you cannot.

Only we dairy farmers can fully appreciate the anguish of mind and spirit suffered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon over the succession of misfortunes that have attended his efforts to produce more milk and make more butter and cheese to help win the war.

MAJ. PAUL A. LARNED

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2202, a bill to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army. The request is made so that a correction may be effected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2202) to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was heretofore ordered to be engrossed and read a third time is reconsidered.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and to substitute the amendment I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to transfer to the active list of the United States Army, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Paul A. Larned, now a major, United States Army, retired (now on active duty): *Provided*, That prior to his restoration to the active list he shall have been found physically qualified for active service in the Regular Army by a board of officers, his name to appear on the active list of the United States Army next below that of the lowest ranking member of the class of 1907, United States Military Academy, now on the active list: *Provided further*, That he shall be carried as an additional number in the grade to which he may be transferred or, at any time thereafter, be promoted: *Provided further*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued by reason of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to restore Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following the passage of the bill an explanation of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The reasons for the suggested change are as follows:

(1) "Reinstate," the verb employed in S. 2202 as drawn, is not precise, because it implies previous separation; therefore, "restore" should be substituted.

(2) The primary purpose is transfer to the active list. The physical examination is necessary. Therefore, the substitute subordinates everything else in the bill to the first phrase "is authorized to transfer."

(3) As S. 2202 is drawn, it might handicap Major Larned for the following reasons:

1. The retirement age is 60. Since Major Larned will be 57 this summer, he would be compelled, under S. 2202 as drawn, to retire in 3 years.

2. If S. 2202 were passed as drawn, Army regulations applicable to Major Larned's retirement would operate to retire him at the age of 60 in the grade of major because he would be transferred to the active list in the grade of major, and because, in 3 years between 57 and 60 he could not gain active commissioned service to qualify for promotion.

3. The Pay Adjustment Act, as applied to Major Larned at retirement, if S. 2202 were passed as drawn, would probably base his retired pay upon the status he had when retired, because he would revert to that status when relieved from active duty.

The substitute is intended to precisely conform to the existing law and Army Regulations, and at the same time authorize the President to transfer Major Larned to the active list in a definite grade higher than when he retired, namely, lieutenant colonel.

This is not quite equal to the grade for his age, but it is high enough so that one can reasonably hope for gain in grade corresponding to age in 3 years so that he could retire at 60 with the normal grade for that retirement age.

You will note that the substitute conforms to the law and regulations in other particulars, namely, that he is placed as an additional number in the grade of lieutenant colonel, and that he is placed next below the lowest ranking name of his class in the Military Academy now on active duty. Further, that it provides that no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued by reason of the passage of the act.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6430, the so-called independent offices appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PATROL OF COAST LINES BY CIVILIAN PILOTS FLYING SMALL AIRPLANES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the Axis Powers have cut our line of supply of tin and rubber. They have not cut our production of gasoline, but they have sunk tankers and merchant marine supply ships right within sight of our shore. We are on the verge of denying our people the supply of, or right to use, gasoline largely because we have not been able to stop these attacks on our shipping in our own waters.

Every lesson of the war points to the power and effectiveness of aircraft. It was from the air that we suffered our greatest nava defeat and humiliation at Pearl Harbor. It was from the air that we lost our planes and airfields in the Philippines. It was from the air that our warships were sunk near Java. It was from the air attacks that the French found that the Maginot line was inadequate in modern war. It was from the air that the British found a force against which the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* could not successfully defend themselves. Yet our tankers and merchant ships go down day after day, with little or no air protection above them.

We have thousands of small airplanes already manufactured and frozen idle on the ground. We have thousands of patriotic, courageous, and competent civilian pilots grounded in our own country. These planes and pilots, unfitted for foreign military service, are capable and competent to provide a constant umbrella over these slow-moving tankers and merchant ships.

By April 16, 1942, the United States had announced the sinking of 131 vessels within close reach of our shore. A total of 857 crew members of these vessels were reported killed, many of them having died in burning oil. The reports announced 1,084 missing and 3,593 rescued. The monetary losses of these ships and their cargoes was certainly well over \$100,000,000.

Ships are the most critical materials of the war, not only from the American standpoint, but for the United Nations. Food and military munitions are piling up awaiting available ships. These losses have averaged over one a day since the war began. They have offset any shipbuilding—actual building of ships—since Pearl Harbor. Announced rates of building are at one and one-fourth ships a day at this time. In other words, the production of ships is only keeping pace with sinkings, and the country has not made any gains in production of the 8,000,000 tons of ships ordered for this year. We are straining the sinews of the steel and shipbuilding industries to produce the vessels and neglecting to apply a remedy which is so readily available.

The great majority of the sinkings are within a stone's throw of the shores. Some have been so close to shore that spectators on the beaches and shore highways were in grandstand seats for these sinkings. Recently, survivors were rescued by row boats.

Every one of these ships sunk means a loss of almost a full day's production for the entire steel and shipbuilding facilities of the Nation. Tankers on which the enemy is concentrating are the most vital type of ship required. Rationing of fuels on both coasts is based on these losses.

We all assume that the Army and Navy have been doing the best they can with the forces available for coastal patrol to halt the sinkings. The results—continuing daily—show that additional help and lots of it, is badly needed.

The help is available—men, equipment, aircraft, and pilots and the necessary skill in administration. It is not

now being used. Utilization of these resources need not disturb the main war effort in any way.

We should take into military service under Army or Navy direction and supervision, enough of the country's light aircraft, and men who have been sportsmen pilots, to operate a 24-hour a day continuous air umbrella along the entire Atlantic coast line.

This "umbrella" should be flown in small, slow airplanes—the only kind of planes that should be used for submarine hunting. They should be armed with one or two depth charges and a two-way radio. They should be flown by sportsmen pilots whose flying skill and knowledge of the capabilities of light airplanes are today lying idle and wasted.

The men are ready to go at once. Details of the projected air antisubmarine patrol in light ships have been worked out. The aircraft are available in almost countless numbers. I understand new planes are now frozen by Government order at a dozen different aircraft factories. The pilots are doing a little flying, but chiefly they are wondering why we are continually losing ships at sea when they know that, if used, they could virtually bring sinkings to a halt in a belt extending from Maine to Florida and 50 miles to sea. Creation of a safety zone of these proportions would protect the coastal traffic we now are losing.

One thousand pilots could do the job. Actually, the country has 100,000 licensed pilots, of whom probably two-thirds have the experience in the air that would qualify them to perform this kind of patrol work. Obviously, the field from which to draw pilots is large. Most of these men are individuals who would not be called to combat, ferry, or instruction duties in the ordinary course of affairs. Used on the patrol, they would release to other duties the highly trained and skilled personnel now attempting in inadequate numbers and with improper types of craft to maintain an air patrol. These men are needed on our fighting fronts—in the Pacific and other theaters of war.

Ground personnel for the light plane patrol should be mostly unskilled. One or two trained mechanics at each base—not more than 150 all told—could supervise the maintenance, service, and inspection of the patrol airplanes.

It should be a volunteer service. The men should be made Army or naval special reservists and placed on temporary active duty, or some other method used to place them under Army or naval supervision. A great knowledge of types of boats, naval procedures, and so forth, is not required. Once the patrol is set up this kind of training could be given.

But primarily the men should be given to understand that any submarine they see will be an enemy sub and should be both reported by radio and attacked. If American submarines must operate along the coasts they can stay out of the patrolled zone or notify the particular units watching the areas where they will maneuver.

The kind of airplanes that could do this job better than any others are types

such as the Piper Cub Cruiser, the Rearwin Cloudster, the Stinson Voyager and 105, the Luscombe, Aeronca and Taylorcraft types. Their speeds are ample—since all will cruise at 80 miles an hour or better. Their range is ample, since most of those mentioned have up to 4 hours of flying—while 2 hours at a time would be the recommended duration for any single patrol flight. Their load-carrying capacities are such that in addition to one pilot they could easily carry two-way radio, ample fuel and lubricants, and up to 350 pounds of depth charges or bombs. Their slow speed is their big advantage. All these airplanes can fly at 60 miles an hour in complete safety. They are easy to fly, land at less than 40 miles an hour; they can be operated from improvised airports with safety by day or night. They all are equally adaptable for either pontoons or wheels. Their initial costs range from \$3,000 down to \$1,500.

Hundreds of these types of airplanes are now available—ready to fly at once. At one factory, the Piper factory, I understand more than 750 airplanes are stacked out, frozen by orders from the Government which prevent their sales to others than those engaged in war work. This factory's capacity is 300 a month alone, and there are at least 6 other plants where suitable types are made. The Civil Aeronautics Authority has closed up to 60 percent of all the Nation's airports, due to demands for an elaborate guard and dispatching system, and more than enough airplanes for the patrol could be commandeered from the closed airports in a few central States. Illinois, among others, could supply the entire requirement of planes for the patrol. Let us take one of these planes, the Piper Club Cruiser, for an example. Here are the performances, weight, range, and other characteristics:

This plane is a standard type found throughout the United States. It weighs 760 pounds empty; will carry a 700-pound load. It will fly as fast as 95 miles an hour and as slow as 45 to 50. It has a 75-horse power engine that consumes only 5 gallons of fuel an hour. In addition to a pilot and 25 gallons of fuel, plus adequate lubricants, it will carry a payload—in this case a military load—of 380 pounds.

This 380 pounds can be divided into 300 pounds of depth charges and 80 pounds of radio and a rubber boat.

Engines for these little airplanes are among the most reliable in aviation. They are made in large numbers by a wide variety of companies. They are available and they can easily be maintained. They give assurance of running for long periods of time, an assurance that is required for pilot morale in over-water operations. Cost of operating the engines is less than \$3 per hour, compared with \$3 a minute for high-powered military engines in service types now being used for this work.

A minimum of instruments is necessary. These little planes can fly slowly enough so that great skill in blind flying and blind navigation is definitely not required by their operators. No planes can operate well in fog, nor can submarines well attack boats in dense fog because of

lack of visibility. If caught at sea by fogs that form, the little planes can be flown down close to the water until they reach shore. Safe landings can be made on beaches or into shallow water, if necessary.

I am informed racks to carry depth charges already have been designed and built for these little planes. Such racks can be installed in 4 hours per ship. No complicated bombsights will be required. The home-made type is sufficient, as used by these pilots in their peacetime flour-bag bombing competition. Obviously, the Navy would supply the bombs and depth charges, and the Army or Navy should supply personnel to service the charges at each base and to man ground radio stations for the patrol.

Definite choosing of patrol fields along the eastern coast should take into account the local terrain, existence or absence of airports, weather factors, and other items. Survey work to pick these locations and get them into shape for patrol flying would require only a short time.

Where necessary, pontoons could be fitted and natural harbors, sheltered bays, and so forth, could be utilized as bases.

Highways and trucking would make supply problems easy in solution. Refueling can be done from drums or 5-gallon cans. That is being done, and has been done.

In considering the patrols special techniques for their flying could easily be worked out. The point is that the little planes, used in recommended numbers, would cover the patrol zone so frequently that no given spot would escape the eyes of observers—except in extraordinary weather conditions—for periods of longer than a few minutes. In other words, an airplane would be over any given spot in any point on the zone at frequent intervals. The present patrols cannot approach this record for frequency, and speeds of patrol planes are so great that observation is cursory at best. There are vast stretches of coast line that cannot conceivably be covered with the present limited equipment and men.

If there is any refueling of enemy submarines from coastal points or from coastal boats, it certainly would be halted under this system. No point, however remote, would be left unguarded, either by day or night. Activities necessary for refueling submarines would certainly be spotted.

On such a patrol there would undoubtedly be losses of planes and men. There would be losses forced by weather, by accidents, and by limitations in experience and skill. The patrol would of necessity be a volunteer service. Inquiry among the pilots in Illinois shows that sufficient men to provide for the operation of the entire patrol could be recruited in a few days by asking for volunteers in Illinois and adjoining States. I understand that some 500 pilots in my State have shown their willingness to serve their country in any capacity, and specifically in this one.

There would constantly be observers in the air who would cover the entire zone, 50 miles to sea, at frequent intervals.

It would be an armed patrol, able to strike at enemy submarines. It would be able also to call up the Navy's regular forces—by air or sea—to assist. There could be no extended attacks on surface vessels without having three or four patrol planes quickly arriving on the scene with their depth bombs, and radios calling up heavier attack units.

A submerged submarine is defenseless against an aircraft, and this point is the crux in the tactics that would be used. Suppose a patrol plane should sight a submarine. If the submarine were on the surface, the patrol ship would circle and immediately call for heavy Army or Navy units. If the submarine should crash dive upon sighting the patrol ship, the patrol pilot could dive on the submarine, fly down to within 10 feet of the water above the diving submarine, and drop its depth charges. No practice or great accuracy would be required to put charges within killing distance of the submarine under those conditions. Under the recommended patrolling system, several of the patrolling aircraft could be called to the scene where any one of them had sighted a submarine within a few minutes after the first alarm sounded.

There could be no repetition of the bold, daylight attacks which have already occurred, prolonged over a period of 20 minutes to 2 or 3 hours.

For night operations slightly different techniques could be used. Every vessel leaves a visible wake in traveling over the surface of the sea. Wakes are visible for miles to air patrols. Submarines on the surface, or surfaced enough to have periscopes out, leave wakes. These could be seen at night from the air.

Probably the best system would be constantly to cover each of our own vessels proceeding through each zone during the night. Vessels operating north or south—along the Atlantic coast for example—would be known. They would be picked up at dusk and planes would fly a constant patrol over them throughout the hours of darkness. Additional methods and alternative methods and devices could be adopted or developed to fit any special conditions or situations, as experience teaches.

In the World War of 1914-18 the British operated just such a patrol as is suggested here, around the coasts of England. It was flown in ships with performance almost exactly comparable to that of the types suggested here. This patrol broke up the submarine menace around the British coasts at that time. Pilots who flew that patrol objected to it after the first few weeks because submarines disappeared, submarine activity ceased, and the patrol became a monotonous one.

At this time the Army and Navy are conducting patrols with a wide variety of planes. A few civil air patrol ships have been used in a cautious patrol which went only 15 miles to sea and carried only radio. A large number of the Army planes now used have been armed only with machine guns, which are almost completely impotent against submarines. Also both the Army and Navy planes which have been used have been high-speed planes whose observation was limited, and there have been only a very

limited number of bases from which they could be operated.

Submarine warfare off our coasts has become a critical affair. It is as much a crisis as was Dunkirk, when British yachtsmen, tugboatmen, and others took their boats, pleasure launches, antique ferry boats, and everything else that would float to carry back to England a few soldiers. No one asked the skippers whether they were civilians or naval officers.

The sportsmen pilots of our entire country are as ready and willing to risk their own lives as were the British; and they can do as effective a job. We believe they should have some sort of regular service supervision over them.

From the minutemen of Lexington through the Indian wars to Dunkirk, to the guerrilla fighting in Serbia, Russia, and elsewhere in conquered nations, there are numberless precedents for using men from civil life as direct auxiliaries to military forces.

We talk of civilian defense, plan black-outs, and appoint block captains to teach us how to hide from the flying sons of our enemies when and if they fly thousands of miles to destroy our cities and war production plants and facilities, but we ground our own civilian pilots and planes while our enemies sink our ships within sight of our shores.

Why freeze our civilian planes and pilots to the ground while our ships and our tankers go down and our American sailors burn in oil within sight of our shores?

On March 31, 1942, I introduced Senate Resolution 233, asking for the appointment of a special Senate committee to investigate and encourage the advanced training in the preliminary essentials of future airmen in our high schools and other educational institutions throughout the land. Promptly the United States Commissioner of Education answered that the Government would institute such training on a vastly increased scale. I commend that action; and I again urge the appointment of a special committee to determine to what extent this work is being done and will be increased.

I further urge that we investigate and encourage the establishment of a vastly enlarged specialist civilian corps of already trained pilots with already available planes to search out and destroy enemy submarines and provide a constant umbrella of air protection to our men and materials within sight of our American shores.

TRANSPORTATION BY BARGE LINE

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] has rendered a very valuable service in bringing to the attention of the Senate the subject which he has discussed. I should like to say a few words on the subject of transportation.

Our ships and tankers are being sunk off our coasts. We anticipate a tie-up of railroad transportation by fall. It is simply not in the picture for the railroads to handle the troops and supplies which will be piling up in the fall. We

have spent many hundred million dollars on our inland waterways and inter-coastal canals. We have developed a 9-foot channel from New Orleans to Minneapolis, near the Canadian border. We have developed a channel on the Missouri River up as far as Sioux City. We have developed a channel from the Mississippi up the Illinois River to Chicago and up the Ohio River as far as Pittsburgh. In this emergency we are not using these great highways, which are so safe from U-boats. If there was ever a time when we could get our money's worth for developing these waterways, it is now.

I have some statistics on the cost of transportation by barge, by pipe line, and by railroad. We have to use all three methods of transportation; but the cheapest of all transportation is the system of barge lines on the rivers. It has been proposed to build a pipe line from the Texas fields to the Atlantic coast. The estimated cost of such a pipe line would be between \$60,000,000 and \$100,000,000.

We could, a year ago, build for about \$20,000, a steel barge 195 feet long, 35 feet wide, and 11 feet deep which would carry 6,600 barrels of oil. Thirty-four barges could handle the maximum daily capacity of a single pipe line, and the cost would be only \$680,000. Further, oil barges can be constructed rapidly, entailing no such vast construction program as is involved in the case of a pipe line, or in building railroad tank cars.

Towboats are presently available, but undoubtedly in an enlarged program additional towboats would have to be built. However, they can be built at a very nominal cost. One such towboat could handle a tow of 14 barges, each barge having a capacity of 6,600 barrels. They could be taken up the Mississippi River from the oil fields of the South to the Ohio River, and to every city along the Ohio River as far as Pittsburgh. They could be taken up the Illinois River, where there are no submarines, to Chicago and towed over the lakes, or the oil could be put in tankers on the lakes and shipped as far east as Pittsburgh. There are two pipe lines at Pittsburgh through which the oil can be pumped to the Atlantic coast.

As to the cost, I have the official figures on the cost of barges. Oil can be hauled on a system of barges for one-half the cost of sending it through a pipe line. The cost of handling oil by barges is much less than the cost of hauling it by rail or by truck.

I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks the figures which I have before me be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Oil now moves by water from Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana fields through the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh, and thence to the Atlantic seaboard consuming centers. Another route is through the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Chicago, thence by lake to Buffalo, N. Y., and

from there by barge canal to the seaboard.

From the national defense standpoint, the maximum utilization of our inland waterways is imperative. These waterways, because they lie in the interior, are protected, and hence far less vulnerable to attack. Further, they are not subject to sabotage and breakdowns, as are pipe lines. Other nations have long since realized these truths and are utilizing their inland waterways to the maximum, not only during wartime but in peacetime.

Facilities constructed for inland-waterway use can readily be utilized in an all-out national defense effort, not only on our rivers but, if necessary, in our coastal and lake harbors as well. With the passing of the emergency the additional facilities which should be built for war purposes would readily be absorbed by industry seeking the low-cost form of transportation for this commodity.

I have called this matter to the attention of the Maritime Commission, but they have been denied priorities on steel. However, there is one thing they can furnish and that is wood. Such barges could be made of wood and could haul gasoline or crude oil just as well as could steel barges. While a steel barge could be built last year for about \$20,000, a wood barge could undoubtedly be built for approximately one-half that amount. As is very often done on the Mississippi, a large towboat can tow 14 barges. Two thousand tons can be carried by each barge, or 20,000 tons in 10 barges. That would be the equivalent of 10 railroad trains of 100 freight cars each, and all that could be pulled by 1 towboat which makes 10 miles an hour and can run day and night, making 240 miles in 24 hours. Such barge transportation can be carried on all through the interior of the United States, from the Gulf to the Canadian border, and can reach all our large cities from Chicago to Pittsburgh. The barges could go along our Atlantic and Gulf coasts on the Intercoastal Waterway; and on that waterway the oil could be hauled perfectly safe, away from submarines, and at the lowest possible transportation cost.

Those who have charge of the transportation of oil from the interior of the country to the Gulf coast, and who have been sending it from there to the Atlantic coast in tankers which have been sunk, it seems to me have neglected their duty. Their attention has been called to the fact that they can use inland waterways. Transportation by barge on the inland waterways is much cheaper than transportation by tankers, much cheaper than transportation through pipe lines; and in view of the fact that such barges can be built of wood, it seems to me that those who have charge of the transportation of oil, coal, or any other heavy commodity are neglecting their duty in not immediately applying their energies toward supplying a form of transportation which would take care of the Atlantic coast, the Gulf coast, and the entire interior of the country, without any danger of sabotage or of having ships or tankers sunk by submarines.

I am now calling to the attention of the Senate, as for more than a year I have called it to the attention of the Maritime Commission and of the Secretary of the Interior, who wanted a pipe line constructed, the fact that for very much less money, and with a resulting greater capacity for the transportation of oil to the Atlantic coast, the method I have suggested could be used, and should be used. The Senator from Illinois has called attention to the need for a special committee to investigate the proposition he advanced this morning. I believe that some action by the Congress may be necessary in order to force upon the executive departments some consideration of the method of transportation I have just discussed.

EXHIBIT A

OIL FOR ATLANTIC SEABOARD FROM SOUTHWEST CAN BE TRANSPORTED AT LOWER COST VIA THE INLAND WATERWAYS THAN BY PROPOSED PIPE LINE

The facts are:

1. Threatened shortage of oil tankers has brought forth suggestions that pipe lines be constructed from southwestern oil fields to Atlantic seaboard points to avoid possible oil famine.
2. Estimated cost of constructing single pipe line from Texas to New York ranges from \$60,000,000 to \$100,000,000. Not considering steel shortage, priorities etc., time of completion estimated at 2 years for single line.
3. A pipe line has limited transportation capacity, estimated at 225,000 barrels per day at maximum efficiency.
4. Mississippi River (including intracoastal canal to Galveston) and Ohio River have been completed at an expenditure by the Government of hundreds of millions of dollars. It has unlimited capacity for transporting oil and is now used extensively by private operators for that purpose.
5. While present facilities (oil barges and towboats) may be adequate for use in ordinary times by private operators, these facilities fall far short of meeting increased demands arising out of the present emergency. However, the existing plant in most instances could be quickly augmented through priority construction of comparatively inexpensive barges, placing far less burden on critical materials and manpower than the construction of an expensive and experimental pipe line. Having a completed waterway with adequate dockage facilities and experience in handling oil by barge, the problem merely reduces itself to adding barges to the existing plant as a railroad would add boxcars to its trains.
6. Cost of steel oil barges ranges up to \$20,000 each, which cost might be materially reduced when produced in quantity. The capacity of an average oil barge (195 feet by 35 feet by 11 feet) is 6,600 barrels. Therefore 34 barges could handle the maximum daily capacity of a single pipe line and the cost would be only \$680,000. Further, oil barges can be constructed rapidly, entailing no such vast construction program as in the case of a pipe line. Towboats are presently available, but undoubtedly an enlarge program would involve a consideration of the need for added power. The waterway has been completed, the right-of-way is there for use, with unlimited capacity, lacking only expansion of equipment.
7. Comparative cost of transporting oil by various forms of transport for the year 1939 is given below:

	Per ton-mile
Crude pipe lines.....	\$0.00477
Gasoline pipe lines.....	.00527
Company ships.....	.00050
Company barges.....	.00259
Chartered ships.....	.00106

	Per ton-mile
Foreign ships.....	\$0.00151
Canadian ships.....	.00264
Company trucks: Package and bulk.....	.06853
Outside trucks:	
Bulk.....	.03697
Package.....	.02621
Railroads:	
Carloads.....	.01640
Less than carload lots.....	.03890
Chartered barges.....	.00680

From the above it is clear that the ton-mile cost of directly operated barge facilities is one-half of such cost by pipe line.

8. Oil moves by water today from the Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana fields via the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh, thence to Atlantic seaboard consuming centers. Another route is via the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers to Chicago, thence by lake to Buffalo and New York Barge Canal to the seaboard.

9. From a national-defense standpoint the maximum utilization of our inland waterways is imperative. These waterways, because they lie in the interior, are protected and hence far less vulnerable to attack. Further, they are not subject to sabotage and break-downs, as would be true of pipe lines. Other nations have long since realized these truths and are utilizing their inland waterways to their maximum.

Facilities constructed for inland waterway use can readily be utilized in an all-out national-defense effort not only on our rivers, but, if necessary, in our coastal and lake harbors as well.

With the passing of the emergency the additional facilities would readily be absorbed by industry seeking the low-cost form of transportation for this commodity.

At the present time there are three all-gasoline pipe lines operating from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pittsburgh district. These three are: The Tuscarora Line, owned by the Tuscarora Oil Co., Ltd., and serving the Pittsburgh district from Bayonne, N. J., to the Keystone pipe line, a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co., from the Pittsburgh district to Marcus Hook, Pa., and the Susquehanna pipe line, owned by the Sun Pipe Line Co., a subsidiary of Sun Oil, Pittsburgh district, Bayonne, N. J. It is being contemplated at the present time to reverse these lines and bring oil from Wood River, Ill., to the Pittsburgh district by barge and transship via pipe line to the seaboard.

BASIC MAGNESIUM, INC.—UNCONSCIONABLE PROFITS IN WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, I rise today to reiterate my statement of April 9 that the Defense Plant Corporation has entered into an agreement with Basic Magnesium, Inc., of Cleveland, Ohio, for construction of a \$73,000,000 magnesium plant at Las Vegas, Nev., that is "so sinister as to indicate that some officials in our Government are guilty of malfeasance in the performance of their duties."

In reaffirming the facts as before stated, I am mindful of an allegation filed April 23 by Jesse Jones with the Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

I now state that Mr. Jones, who is accountable for the Defense Plant Corporation's affairs, has resorted in his statement to evasion, subterfuge, distortion of facts, and an attack on the investigators of the case.

Mr. Jones' attempt to saddle the responsibility for Basic Magnesium profiteering on the War Department and the now defunct O. P. M. will meet with as little success as did his effort to blame the President of the United States and the

British and Dutch Governments for Mr. Jones' own failure to provide the Nation with rubber.

My statement was based on the testimony of witnesses sworn to tell the truth at hearings in Las Vegas, conducted on March 23 and 24 by the Truman committee.

My statement was based on record and fact. However Mr. Jones may try to confuse the issue, the fact remains that Basic Magnesium will receive \$300,000 to supervise the construction of the plant, \$560,000 per year as an operating fee, \$280,000 per year on royalties, and \$1,000,000 in the event of the sale of the plant. All this was testified before the Truman committee as possible return on an admitted investment of less than \$50,000.

Nothing Mr. Jones can say can dispute the fact that extortionate salaries are being paid from the taxpayers' money to the officials of the company, salaries as high as \$36,000 a year.

D. W. Stewart was paid \$15,000 by Eells when employed by Basic Refractories, but when he was transferred to Basic Magnesium and his salary was paid from public funds he was given \$20,000 a year, an increase of \$5,000.

Mr. Howard P. Eells testified under oath that H. C. Lee, who was employed by Eells' company in Cleveland at a salary of \$7,800 per year, was transferred to Basic Magnesium, Inc., at \$12,000 per year, an increase of \$4,200.

W. W. Patnoe was transferred by Eells from Basic Refractories to Basic Magnesium. His former salary was \$10,000, but now that Eells is handling the taxpayers' money Mr. Patnoe is receiving \$13,800, an increase of almost \$4,000 a year.

All these huge increases in salaries are to be paid from public funds—these same increases being approved by Jesse Jones. It is interesting to note how valuable the services of these men become upon being paid out of the taxpayers' money.

That this unusual contract provides for extortionate profits is graphically borne out by the fact that the personal salary of Howard P. Eells is \$50,000 per year, or equal to the entire assets of Basic Magnesium, Inc., when the contract was signed. This amazing salary is not the only income or interest of Mr. Eells. He receives \$18,000 per year as president of Basic Refractories. Although Eells is in supreme command, he has not spent more than 60 days at the plant since the contract was signed in August of 1941. Is it any wonder that such miserable progress has been reflected in the construction of the plant?

Nothing Mr. Jones can say can dispute the testimony of the project manager of Basic Magnesium, who stated, at the hearings, that the project is only 9-percent complete. The testimony of the project manager clearly indicates that Mr. Howard P. Eells, Jr., is grossly inefficient and incompetent.

If a man built an expensive home with a garage adjoining, and if the builder attempted to justify his delay by pointing out that the garage was 60-percent finished, I doubt if it would be considered that the house was ready to be occupied.

When it was pointed out by the Truman investigating committee that the plant is only 9-percent complete, Mr. Jones countered that the settling basin and the preparation plant are 60-percent complete. General Knudsen, sent out by the War Department because Mr. Jones was admittedly dissatisfied with the progress of the plant, reported that the first unit was 40-percent complete. Mind you, I said the first unit. There are 10 units to this vital magnesium-producing plant. If one unit is 40 percent complete, then 10 units are, in reality, 4 percent complete. With the garages, the plant is 9 percent complete.

Howard Mann, project manager, in an attempt to justify to the committee the miserable showing of the management of Basic Magnesium, placed the blame on organized labor. While it is obviously a futile and weak excuse, is it not just what we would expect from this \$36,000 executive?

Although, as I have said, Mr. Jones states that the Defense Plant Corporation engineers were not satisfied with the construction progress, and as early as January caused engineers of the War Department to investigate the project, yet as late as March of 1942, no change in management had been effected. Could it be that Mr. Jones, who has contracted for the expenditure of \$63,000,000 of public funds—now grown to \$73,500,000—finds himself obligated to defend the extravagance and incompetence of a typical promoter?

Does Mr. Jones mean that the members of the Truman committee—who have no personal interest in this case—are so deficient in intelligence as to be unable to grasp the significance of that testimony and come to the conclusions they wrote into their preliminary report? I quote from that report:

The subcommittee considers it of prime importance that these huge plants constructed with Government funds be built around the most economical processes available, to the end that they may compete commercially after the war. Care should be taken that their cost of operation should not be so high that they could not meet post-war commercial competition. * * *

The facts disclosed at Las Vegas created the impression that Defense Plant Corporation is paying tremendous fees for "know how," which so far has delivered miserable progress, the metal-producing units being only 9 percent complete although the contract was signed August 13, 1941.

After taking note of this miserable progress, I am inclined to believe that the Defense Plant Corporation, instead of paying for "know how," is paying for "do not know how." I quote further from the report:

The subcommittee is prepared now to urge most strongly that Defense Plant Corporation refuse to accept any such exorbitant royalty terms as proposed by Basic Magnesium, Inc. * * *

This proposed lease appears to the subcommittee as one of the most flagrant attempts at war profiteering to come to its notice. * * *

The subcommittee is of the opinion that a plant, especially one of this magnitude, ought not to have been commenced until after the Defense Plant Corporation had reached an agreement as to the terms of the license under which it was to operate and as

to the cost of the raw material (magnetite ores) from which the magnesium was to be produced. * * *

These terms seem to put a premium on mismanagement and incompetency.

I would be derelict in my duty if I did not bring this matter to the attention of the Senate and insist on action being taken to place this plant on an immediate and permanent production schedule.

There are two vitally essential factors in the production of magnesium:

First, an economic process;

Second, raw material.

At the time of signing of this contract neither of these was insured, and even to this day there is serious doubt as to the agreement on the cost, quality, and quantity of the ore supply.

While Mr. Jones states that it is a fixed policy for the Defense Plant Corporation never to reimburse an operator for funds expended in obtaining a contract, Mr. Eells testified under oath that the sum of \$211,000 was being repaid Basic Magnesium by the Defense Plant Corporation. Mr. Jones and Mr. Eells should get together on their statements.

Mr. Jones has ignored the recommendations of the committee, and has insulted the legislative branch of the Government, which he seemingly relegates to a position inferior to his own.

Mr. Jones said that my statement was "unworthy of a United States Senator." We have not reached, and never will reach, the time in our national life when it becomes unworthy a Member of the Senate to draw to the attention of the people extortionate salaries and war profits which come from public funds. In fact, it is the duty of every Senator and Representative to protect the interests of the taxpayers.

I am thinking of the people of Nevada and of the country at large, the people who must work a lifetime to maintain their families in respectability, the people who are depriving themselves and their children of life's necessities in order to pay their taxes and to buy War Bonds and Stamps. Think how many 25-cent Defense Stamps it will take to pay the \$36,000 salary of the project manager of Basic Magnesium.

The welfare of this Nation in this world crisis is the one vital element in the fight to preserve our liberty.

I repeat, as I said on April 9 in addressing this body, that I shall not hesitate to exercise every resource at my command to prevent or bring to light war profiteering during this conflict.

I am informed that the Truman committee will continue hearings on this matter at an early date.

When the facts are all finally in the record, I am sure that the committee's findings will be acclaimed at the bar of public opinion as a great contribution to clean government.

I intend to address the Senate further on this matter in the future.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee explain the effect of the committee amendments, and the reasons for the committee's action?

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. I suppose the Senator from Wisconsin desires that I explain some of the more important items of the bill; I do not suppose he wants me to discuss all of them.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Gerry	O'Daniel
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Rosier
Bilbo	Herring	Russell
Bone	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Hughes	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bunker	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Downey	Murdock	Wheeler
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as we all know, in the independent offices appropriation bill there are a great many diverse items. Several questions were raised in the committee, and, at the request of the Senator from Wisconsin, I will try to single out the more important ones. One grew out of the building known as the Information Building, at the corner of Fifteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. That was settled in this way: The building had already been constructed; the President had a perfect right to have it erected, and there could be no question about that; but the

amount provided by the other House for the Office of Government Reports was reduced by the Senate committee from \$1,475,000 to \$1,075,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. Let me suggest to the very able Senator from Tennessee that, as we reach the items, they be discussed in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would much prefer to proceed in that way.

Mr. McNARY. I find it difficult to follow an explanation along general lines.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I did not intend to request the Senator from Tennessee to make a general explanation of all the items in the bill on which the committee has taken action, but I wanted him to make an explanation of the committee amendments which have to do with the National Resources Planning Board, since they constitute the first group of amendments on which the Senate will be called upon to act.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will be glad to do that, and I think it is better to let the explanation be made as the items are reached.

For the National Resources Planning Board \$688,845 was provided by the House of Representatives.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator recall what the Budget Bureau recommended?

Mr. McKELLAR. I can give the Senator the figures in a few moments. The amount provided by the House of Representatives was cut down by \$268,000, so as to provide an appropriation of \$400,000.

The National Resources Planning Board wanted to go into the defense-housing business. It will be noted from the amendment at the bottom of page 5, line 21, that the committee thought that the Board ought not to go into the housing business. Congress by legislative act had only recently consolidated the various housing authorities into one, and the President, about the same time or a little later, entered an Executive order consolidating housing activities. So it did not seem to the committee to be necessary that the National Resources Planning Board should go into that particular business; and so that provision was stricken out.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I must confess, Mr. President, that I have been so completely absorbed in the hearings of the Patents Committee, in which I was so kindly invited to participate by the chairman of that committee, although I am not a member of it, that it has been utterly impossible for me to read all the testimony in connection with the pending appropriation bill, although I have to admit that I had ample notice that it was coming up. The Senator, however, knows the circumstances under which we labor. We become tied up and absorbed in one matter and cannot do more than one thing at a time—at least, I cannot do so. I make that explanation be-

cause I have skimmed over the testimony this morning and do not find anything in it indicating that there has been any desire on the part of the National Resources Planning Board to go into the housing business in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read to the Senator what the House bill provided:

National defense activities: For expenses necessary for the planning activities of the National Resources Planning Board in the interest of national defense, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase of books of reference and periodicals; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with development, conservation, and use of the resources of the Nation; traveling expenses; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board; purchase of office equipment and supplies without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes when the amount involved in any case does not exceed \$50, and not to exceed \$100,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to said section 3709, or classification laws, \$400,000, of which not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available for printing and binding.

The committee thought that that was entirely outside the province of the Resources Planning Board, and, for that reason, the provision was eliminated by the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator stated that the committee struck it out because the Board was going into the housing business.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is nothing here that provides that the Board shall go into housing activities.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can see from the item I have just read what they were going to do. They could do almost anything under heaven. I think they claimed at the time, if I remember the testimony aright, that they were going to plan for conditions after the war; they were preparing plans for building which might be undertaken after the war.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand that.

Mr. McKELLAR. And it seemed to the committee that such a program might well be postponed for the present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I rose to interrupt the Senator's explanatory statement because he stated that the reason for the elimination of this appropriation was that this organization was going into the housing business, and I could find nothing in the record and nothing in the text of the bill upon which to justify such a statement. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator from Tennessee, inadvertently, made the statement about housing when he meant national defense.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; that is what I thought, and I merely wanted the record to be cleared up.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is another item in connection with this subject, a proviso—

That no part of the funds appropriated under this item shall be used for the performance of any functions or duties other than the functions heretofore authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board.

That is a provision which has been in the law heretofore, and the committee thought it should be in the act now proposed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What is the effect of the proviso?

Mr. McKELLAR. To be perfectly frank about it, we could not say at this time how the enlarged and increased activities of the National Resources Planning Board could be of any great value to the war effort, and our principal desire has been to eliminate, wherever it was possible to do so, expenses in connection with the activities which were not primarily for war purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I realize that it is probably very difficult in the present temper of the Senate, to resist successfully an amendment by the committee which proposes to make such a substantial reduction in an appropriation bill. I also know that there has been much derision of planning in general, and many derogatory statements have been made about it; but the function of the Resources Planning Board prior to our entry into the war was, insofar as possible, to gather, assimilate, digest, and present in usable form, all the scientific and statistical information essential to the foundation of a sound national policy for the utilization, conservation, and replenishment of the natural resources of this Nation.

When this country was discovered, and prior to the time when the white man began to utilize its natural resources, it represented one of the greatest examples, if not the greatest example, of the beneficence of the Creator in providing the essential materials for the building of a civilization.

In the development of our natural resources without planning, and because largely of the rapid increase in population, we were profligate. Thomas Jefferson was one of the first men to observe that the farming practices in vogue in his day were leading to soil erosion. He recognized, as have most others since that time, I think, that soil is one of the most precious assets a nation can have.

Under virgin conditions it takes Nature about 400 years to create 1 inch of topsoil. It has been some time since I have looked into this matter, but the most recent figures I have available indicate that a conservative estimate is that in this country wind and water erosion are resulting in the loss of about 3,000,000,000 tons of topsoil annually. Once the topsoil is gone, the land becomes uninhabitable, and we have only to go into some of the older agricultural sections of this Nation to find the gaping holes which are already evident along the hillsides. In the South there is one county which is practically entirely eroded.

It was with an appreciation of the fact that we had been profligate in the

exploitation and utilization of our natural resources that the National Resources Planning Board was created. The State from which I come, and which I have the honor, in part, to represent in the United States Senate, was once one of the greatest timber States in the Union. Once it had enormous wealth in the form of lands which were in the public domain, school lands, land-grant areas, Indian lands; but the policy of both the State and the Federal Governments at that time was to permit the development of the lands regardless of the effect upon the resources, and the record shows that unfortunately both State and Federal Governments often closed their eyes while millions of board feet of timber were stolen from the public domain.

One Indian reservation in my State once had a magnificent stand of virgin timber. In years gone by a certain company obtained a contract to take the dead and down timber from that reservation; but when they got through there was not a stick of merchantable timber standing on stumpage in the reservation. I digress too greatly, but I cite this as an evidence of what may happen because of the wastage of natural resources. The company which I have in mind not only stripped the timber, but burned the dead and down timber and the slashings, and in large measure made the soil untillable for years to come. Once they had stripped this great natural resource from the land in the northern part of my State, they moved on to more virgin fields and left behind for the overburdened taxpayers of the communities affected the problem of caring for their citizens, who once had had economic opportunity as a result of the timber exploitation, but who found when the land had been denuded that their economic foundations had been swept away. Literally thousands upon thousands of dollars, if not hundreds of thousands, have been poured down the W. P. A. sluice into those counties in order to maintain and to keep from actual malnutrition and undernourishment some of their residents.

Mr. President, I confess at the outset that I have not had the time to prepare for an adequate discussion of this matter today, but, if my memory serves me correctly, the best estimate of the ultimate effect of the manner in which our timber resources have been utilized and exploited is to the effect that, up to the time when we embarked on defense effort, despite all the money that has been invested by the present administration in forestation and reforestation, at the then existing level of the consumption of timber, within 125 years there would not be a stick of merchantable timber standing within the confines of continental United States. Other Senators are likewise familiar with our utilization of other resources.

Therefore, Mr. President, to draw an analogy between Government and private business, I say that our natural resources are the great assets of the corporation of the United States of America; and upon them the civilization in which

we live and the standard of living for this and for oncoming generations depend.

It is true that new fields are being opened up by research which indicate that we may be able, with the progress of science and invention and the advance in chemical methods, to find suitable and practical substitutes for some of our natural resources, but I think it is safe to say that until such substitutes are adequately developed, the assets of the United States of America are chiefly represented in its great people and in the natural resources upon which the people must depend for the maintenance of their standard of life.

Mr. President, in the light of the situation which I have briefly depicted, the President of the United States created an organization to study the problems involved in the preservation of our natural resources and to make recommendations to the Executive and to the Congress looking to their conservation and restoration.

Other Senators may not like the kind of work this board has been doing and is now doing, but, in my opinion, for the Appropriations Committee to abolish the only agency we have that is making any effort, so far as we know, looking to a comprehensive and continuous study of the utilization, conservation, and restoration of our natural resources, is a tragic mistake.

Furthermore, as I understand, the President of the United States has designated this board—insofar as the executive branch of the Government is concerned—to coordinate, arrange for, and actually to execute planning for the post-war period. Perhaps the Congress, if it should take this matter up *de novo*, might decide upon some other kind of organization but the fact remains that so far as the executive branch of the Government is concerned, this is the agency designated by the President to carry on what I regard with the exception of winning the war, as perhaps the most important subject we have to consider, for, Mr. President, I state the man is blind indeed who does not appreciate that once this war comes to an end the Nation will face the most critical, the most complex, the most difficult problems that have ever confronted a civilized people in the written history of the world.

When we can see ahead to a day when it will be no longer an exaggeration to say that we may have a national debt which will be equal to the total wealth of the United States, I think it must be realized that we are out on an uncharted financial sea. So far as this Government is concerned, to stretch the analogy until it breaks, we are in the situation of financial and fiscal navigators who have lost all their charts and sextants and who find that the stars in the heavens have all slipped out of place.

We are going to build up in this country the most gigantic industrial plant the world has ever seen. It will make the so-called surplus of industrial capacity which in part produced the economic problems with which we have been wrestling since the last World War and be-

fore we became involved in the present war, pale into insignificance.

Mr. President, we are proposing, to all intents and purposes—and I have no doubt that in the end somehow we will reach that goal—to underwrite the entire productive machinery of this war. We are in the business now of building plant capacity to bring about that result. The huge concentration of war contracts is producing what may now be called a defense migration. In order that these huge plants may be properly manned, men and women are moving great distances from their present habitations. They are filling and congesting various areas to such an extent that we have spent astronomical figures for so-called defense housing. Have Senators any idea, can they grasp the nature of the problems which will confront us when that machine begins to slow down after this war shall have been ended?

We are expanding agriculture again in connection with the food-for-victory program. It was the expansion of agriculture, in order to meet the comparatively limited demands of the last war, which helped to create the dark days through which agriculture, generally speaking, has passed since 1920. We have been studying the agricultural problem ever since the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] first introduced the McNary-Haugen bill. I do not think any student of the agricultural problem would undertake to say that as yet we have found any solution for it. Nevertheless, the war must necessarily intensify that problem, because now our exports are no longer confined to the basic commodities. They embrace fats and oils and the concentrated forms of dairy products, so that the entire agricultural industry is bound to be bulged out of shape just as manufacturing industry will be bulged out of shape. When the time comes when no more lend-lease money is being spent, when the time comes when the abnormal demands of the Army and the Navy cease, cannot Senators envisage the nature of the problem which will confront us? Can they not see something of its form and shape and magnitude, even though they cannot see it in all its terrible aspects?

The proposal of the Appropriations Committee is to put an end to any planning for the post-war period so far as the executive branch of the Government is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the amount is cut down to \$400,000. It is not eliminated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The appropriation with respect to the national defense activities is entirely eliminated.

Mr. TAFT. But there is still an appropriation of \$400,000 provided for the post-war program.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is the more accurate statement, and I appreciate

what the Senator from Ohio has said in correcting me. I refer to page 39 of the committee hearings, to what is evidently a prepared statement which Dr. Merriam put in the record, from which I read, as follows:

AMOUNT OF HOUSE REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION
FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF BOARD

1. The House reduced the defense appropriation for our work next year from \$700,705, recommended in the President's Budget estimates, to \$400,000. We do not know what part of our defense activities the House committee thought should be abandoned or curtailed. We believe that all of the war and post-war planning activities on which we are now engaged should be continued and expanded.

DEFENSE FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1942

2. The defense funds available to the Board for the current fiscal year total \$775,000, and the Budget request for next year was \$700,705. Our current funds are made up of \$400,000 appropriated in last year's independent offices bill plus an allocation of \$375,000 from the President's emergency fund. It may be that the House committee prefers to have the Board rely on further allocations from the President's emergency funds. We would prefer to have our work financed through the customary appropriation procedures of the Congress.

The fact is that the Budget Bureau recommended \$775,000 for national defense activities. That amount was reduced by the other House to \$400,000, and the Senate committee has eliminated that altogether. Some \$700,000, as I understand from the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], was recommended by the President for the current and post-war activities of the Board. The House reduced that amount to \$668,845, and the Senate committee has reduced it to \$400,000. So certainly one of two things is bound to happen: Either this work will not be well done in any field, or it will be curtailed, and the Board will not be able to carry on adequately its normal activities, so far as natural resources and post-war planning are concerned.

Mr. President, no other Senator is more anxious than am I to do whatever is humanly possible in wartime to prevent the decline of the legislative arm of the Government. I think the survival of democracy is involved in our preventing the shriveling and wasting away of the legislative arm of the Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It seems to me that the subject of post-war planning, as the Senator has envisaged its need when the war is over, is a very large and appropriate subject for consideration by the whole Nation, but it is striking that the legislative branch of the Government is doing little of the post-war planning. It is being done by the executive branch.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was just coming to that, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I just stated that I am as anxious as is any other Senator to, insofar as possible, prevent the decline of the legislative arm. I know it cannot be done entirely because the legis-

lative branch in time of war, unfortunately, has to delegate vast power. That is the situation which confronts us; we have to delegate power, and it has been done in every war in which we have ever been engaged. In that direction, however, I do not want anything done which does not have to be done.

So far as the Congress is concerned, it has no agency; it has no staff; it has no way in which it can make such a study. I think it should have. I should be glad to support legislation to create a joint economic staff for the House and Senate to cover the entire field, just as we have a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to assist the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee in handling one phase of our fiscal problem, namely, taxation. However, we do not have such a staff in the economic field, and I see little prospect of getting it. Certainly the Appropriations Committee is not recommending it.

My only point is that if we accept these amendments we paralyze, or at least drastically impair, the activity of the only organization in the Government which is making a study of the situation which will confront us when the war is over. If we ask Army and Navy representatives they tell us frankly that they are not concerned with that subject. It is not in their field. So it is with other branches of the Government. They are busy with their own problems, just as we are. If we had a committee, let us say, on natural resources planning, post-war planning, or whatever one may choose to call it, every morning the members of that committee would probably find themselves, as I am now, confronted with the choice of three or four important committees, all meeting simultaneously, and would have to decide which committee to attend. That is not the kind of atmosphere under which contemplative intellectual effort can be continuously carried on. If we had a staff we could direct it, and the staff could probably carry on such a study for us; but we do not have it.

I think it would be a tragic mistake for a country confronted with what everybody acknowledges to be the greatest problems that any country has ever faced, on the basis of so little testimony and so little consideration, to take a meat ax and chop down or badly slash activities which are studying some kind of a program with which to meet the terrible problems of the post-war period. It does not follow that Congress must adopt such a program, but somebody will be charged with the responsibility of formulating such a plan; and some kind of a plan should be available on which those who may be here when this war is over may start to gnaw.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish briefly and in a general way to endorse the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin. Nobody has spoken to me about this appropriation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Inasmuch as the Senator has raised that point, let me say

that no one has spoken to me. I did not know anything about it. I confess that I did not even know that the amendment was in the bill until I arrived here at 12 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure of that. I myself did not know until I arrived on the floor of the Senate today that the committee had recommended a reduction in the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board. Nobody has spoken to me about it, and in the very brief remarks which I shall make I shall not be speaking for anyone except myself.

Mr. President, we all realize that the immediate task ahead of us is to win the war; and I think that, without regard to party, religious differences, color, or condition, we are all enlisted for the duration in the effort to win the war. Nevertheless, we cannot make ourselves oblivious to the fact that when this war is over some kind of a world will result. There will be economic, political, social, religious, spiritual, financial, and perhaps military problems. We all know that when this war is over and the United Nations have won, as we all expect that they will, the task which will confront humanity will be almost beyond the ken of men who now think and live in the midst of the effort to win it.

We cannot afford to wait until we shall have won the victory to decide what we are to do in regard to the readjustments which will be necessary in order to preserve what we are now fighting for in this great war.

Nobody has said anything to me about this appropriation. I have not been asked by any member of the National Resources Planning Board to say anything about it or to vote against the amendment of the committee reducing the appropriation; but I have certain general convictions on the subject which lead me to the conclusion that we cannot afford to ignore the problems which will face this country and the world when we shall have ceased our military and naval operations and the treaty of peace shall have been written and ratified, and we again come to a period of reconstruction, as we did following the last war, when we failed to meet the situation which has been so eloquently described by the Senator from Wisconsin, and which I think all of us realize we must face.

Various resolutions have been introduced in the Senate and in the other House providing for the creation of committees of one kind or another to make an investigation of post-war conditions. None of those resolutions has been adopted. Some of them provide for a Senate committee to look into the subject, some for a House committee, and some for a joint committee.

The President has set up a sort of interdepartmental organization to look into post-war conditions and make suggestions as to remedies, possibly in the way of legislation dealing with the subject. When this war is over and we shall have won our victory—and it will not be over until we shall have won our victory—perhaps eight, ten, or twelve mil-

lion men will come back out of the Army and Navy to resume their positions in the civil life of our country. That is a suggestion which applies only to the United States. Out of all the armies of the world perhaps thirty or forty million men will come back. Nobody can tell now. During this war our economic, social, and political structure is undergoing readjustments which twist and warp the normal life of our Nation and of the world. Somebody must be thinking in advance. Somebody must be planning ahead—not necessarily planning in a way which we must follow, or with suggestions to which we must adhere; but, unless we are utterly foolish, somebody must be looking ahead to plan what kind of a world we are to have when this war ends, and what must be the social, political, financial, industrial, and economic solutions of the problems which we shall face.

Personally I have great respect for the National Resources Planning Board. I do not know anybody on it except Mr. Delano. So far as I now recall, I have no personal acquaintance with anybody else on that Board or employed by the Board; but I do know that Mr. Delano was brought to Washington by Woodrow Wilson, who was President during World War No. 1. I know in a general way that he and those who are associated with him have no axes to grind, no selfish motives to promote. They are not interested in a job for themselves or for anyone else. They are interested in the future of this country. I have confidence in their disinterested outlook and approach to the problems which face this Nation and the world.

I do not know whether the proposed reduction in the Budget estimate is justified. No one has said anything to me about it. No one has called me on the telephone about it. I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee; and, of course, with my physical, temporal, and intellectual limitations, I cannot keep current on the hearings and testimony before every committee in the Senate with reference to legislation and appropriations.

I make no criticism whatever of the Committee on Appropriations. I am sure that as a whole and individually the committee did what it thought was its duty to do. I realize the pressure on Members of the Senate, on Members of the House, and on Congress as a whole to reduce what are called nondefense appropriations. Nevertheless, I realize the difficulty of differentiating between defense and nondefense appropriations. We cannot abandon the ordinary processes of Government because we are at war; we must keep them going. I think that when the Bureau of the Budget estimates a certain amount as either necessary or desirable for an agency of this sort, which is projecting itself into the future to some extent, trying to visualize what we shall be up against when this war is over, trying to devise remedies which it will submit only for our consideration when the war is over, we are at least justified in inquiring specifically as to the necessity and reason for the proposed reduction in a very modest appropriation of this kind.

I have not as yet made up my mind how I am going to vote on this amendment of the committee. Perhaps it is justified. I am always anxious to support the action of the committee, and I realize that the members of the committee are just as patriotic and as sincere as I am; but I cannot help expressing some disturbance to my mental operations because of the reduction of an amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for what I regard as an essential activity in trying to forecast what will finally be the solution of the problems which will face this country when we have devoted ourselves financially, economically, industrially, socially, and religiously, to say nothing of politically, to the first consideration that confronts all of us, namely, the winning of a great victory for the forces of democracy, and when that has been done the preservation of that democracy and the handing down to our descendants the liberty and a liberalism which will justify the enormous sacrifices we are to make in winning that victory.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I was simply going to ask the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Tennessee to take note of one or two facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to reply to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want the Senator from Tennessee to reply to the Senator from Kentucky; but if he will yield to me for a moment, I should like to call to his attention and to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky, without particularly taking issue with his observations, one or two facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall take only a minute or two.

The National Resources Planning Board is one of the agencies being studied by the committee of which I happen to be chairman, and of which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] are the other members. The committee was created by the Senate to look into overlapping and duplication and other matters of that kind, to see how we could make the Federal Government machine a little more definite and direct and less wasteful. Of course, our studies are not yet completed, but they are nearing a stage of completion. We have heard from every department of the Government, and I think we can make some suggestions in our report—some of them not very sensational, but worth while, and which I think will save a good many million dollars.

Coming down to the National Resources Planning Board, the functions of that Board, as the Board states them to the committee and as the law sets them forth, are as follows: They are to study housing, transportation, health, welfare, employment, and the consumption process. All these functions are already being

performed by the National Housing Agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Board of Investigation and Research of the Transportation Agency. Likewise, the Office of Defense Health and Welfare is making a study, the Public Welfare Agency is making a study, the Works Progress Administration is making a study, the Social Security Board is making a study, the Railroad Retirement Board is making a study, the Department of Labor is making a study, the Federal Trade Commission is making a study, the Department of Agriculture is making a study, and the Office of Price Administration is making a study. Each of them is making a study of the post-war effect and what we should do about it.

Superimposed on those 13 different, individual studies is the study being made by the National Resources Planning Board. The point I want to make is that the problems which this Board is supposed to study are already being studied by other departments and agencies of the Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. As to the studies made by the other boards and agencies mentioned by the Senator, some of which are particularly confined to the war situation and not to the long-time future prognostication of remedies and situations of that kind, let me ask to what extent they are differentiated from the National Resources Planning Board, which is more or less of a permanent organization looking far ahead to planning for situations which may exist long after the war.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand the Senator. I should say that the boards I have named are studying the problems which will be presented not only during the war but after the war, and what should be done about them. For instance, take the railroad problem: The Interstate Commerce Commission is considering the problem of keeping transportation in being during the war and the problem of what will be the effect on transportation after the war, so that they will have specific recommendations to make with regard to the railroads. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that, in my humble judgment, there is not a group of men in America who, unless they would give the subject their full time, to the exclusion of everything else except meals and sleep, could even faintly in one board develop the rehabilitation program which will be necessary for this country when the war is over.

The subject of transportation alone would require examination and investigation for months in order to meet the problems which will arise, such as re-equipping the railroad manufacturing plants, so that, after making shells, they may return to making boosters for locomotives, and all manner of similar things.

My brief examination into these matters convinces me that we must not be carried away by the titles of the boards or by the caliber of the men who head

the boards. Mr. Delano is one of the best, in my judgment, and what I am saying is no reflection on him. The fact is that the boards are largely names. They will not and cannot, in the nature of things, put together a plan to handle a subject that has so many diverse ramifications. These studies are already being made.

The functions of the Science Committee of the National Resources Planning Board, which is one of its branches, appear to be a complete duplication of those performed by the National Defense Research Committee of the Office of Scientific Research and Development of the Office of Emergency Management. That is an actual committee. Think of it! In the Office of Emergency Management is a committee called the National Defense Research Committee of the Office of Scientific Research and Development of the Office of Emergency Management.

The function of planning and developing the National Roster, recently transferred from the Civil Service Commission to the newly created Manpower Commission, is likewise alleged to be a function of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, through its National Defense Research Committee.

I am in no position to say, and I should not want to take the responsibility now of saying, that the entire appropriation ought to be stricken out; but in another 30 days I hope to be able to show that there are any number of Government agencies that are duplicating the work of other agencies, with a resultant tremendous waste of money, at a time when our debt is going to sky-high proportions, and when every dollar will be needed sooner or later in order to carry the load of credit which the impact of this war will put upon the Nation.

Therefore, I am hopeful that the Senate will agree to the committee amendment, and that it will be taken to conference, where there can be further examination into the matter. It may be only a couple of hundred thousand dollars here and there, or \$5,000, which are drops in the bucket; but, in my judgment, the nation which has the most drops left in the bucket will be the nation which will have the reserve punch to hit the other fellow, and to achieve victory in this war. We cannot afford to begin wasting our drops now. This is an all-out war. It is going to take everything we have.

I simply wanted to bring this duplication picture to the attention of the Senate, because I think it illustrates how we can reduce appropriations without at all hampering the proper performance of functions.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further for a moment, let me say that I appreciate what the Senator from Maryland has said. I have no criticism of him and, of course, no criticism of the Board, which is composed, I believe, of very excellent gentlemen. I have no information from them. I realize that, no doubt, there is duplication in

various agencies of the Government looking toward future determination, consideration and solution of problems which we shall face when the war is over.

What I said awhile ago was the expression of my general attitude toward the things that we must confront in the days which are to come, but I do not want, in order to save a few dollars, though I am subject, of course, to information and conviction on that subject, to cripple or handicap any important agency that is dealing with this subject in undertaking to serve the American people. I am still open-minded, I will say to the Senator, on the particular matter we are now discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear the Senator from Kentucky say that, because I agree very strongly with him that Mr. Delano, Dr. Merriam, and the other members of the Board are delightful gentlemen; but the Committee on Appropriations felt that it was its duty to cut down appropriations not necessary to the war effort. We thought it was essential to save when we could. This appropriation comes directly under the rule which was applied to all the other reductions made in this bill. We have nothing in the world against the Board. As I have said, the members of the Board are delightful gentlemen; but we came to the conclusion that this particular work could well be postponed for this year, and perhaps next year, until we know something more about what is going to be the result of the war. I desire to quote from Dr. Merriam, who is vice chairman of the Board.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my remarks a while ago I stated that I did not personally know the members of the Board other than Mr. Delano. I do know Dr. Merriam; I have collaborated with him in many labors which I hope may some time result in good to the country. I have a very high regard for him, and I did not mean by my remarks to indicate that I did not know Dr. Merriam. It may be that I am better acquainted with the other members of the Board than I realize.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am very much interested in what has been said by the distinguished majority leader and other Senators. Here is a recognized duplication of effort. When in the world are we going to begin to remove these duplications? When we reach a place where we may begin, are we going to have some assistance from the administrative bodies, or is the Congress of the United States going to be required, by main strength and awkwardness, if I may put it that way, to go ahead without any assistance or cooperation and do the work itself?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say that this is typical of the reductions made in the bill, and if this re-

duction fails—and it may be necessary to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it—we might just as well say, "Come in, gentlemen, take what you want," for it will be useless to do otherwise.

I said this particular work could be postponed. Let us see if the Senate thinks that it could be postponed. They are making a research. I quote from the testimony given by Dr. Merriam, who came before the committee. Research is being made by the Board, for instance, into—

1. The right to work, usefully and creatively, through the productive years.

The appropriation was asked for further investigation and report on the research work these gentlemen are doing. The committee thought that further research into the right to work, usefully and creatively, through the productive years, might be postponed for a year or two until the war is over.

2. The right to fair pay, adequate to command the necessities and amenities of life in exchange for work, ideas, thrift, and other socially valuable service.

That is the second line of research work they are to undertake and to report on. We thought that might be postponed until the emergency is over.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. And particularly now, when the same functions are already being performed by two or three other agencies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Precisely.

Mr. REED and Mr. VANDENBERG addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment. Let me make the statement myself. Precisely; they might be postponed when other agencies are doing exactly the same kind of work and making the same kind of reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Kansas, who, I think, rose first, and then I will yield to other Senators.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to add to what the Senator from Tennessee has said, that somebody, for example, the Senator from Maryland, who is a member of the special committee making inquiries of the activities of the various governmental administrative agencies, might tell us how many agencies are doing the same work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Right on that point—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out that there are many agencies engaged in such work. For example, the Department of Labor is constantly comparing wage scales in different sections of the country in different activities, such as carpenters and bricklayers, with the cost of living; the Office of Price Administration is doing the same thing; the

Bureau of Agricultural Economics is comparing the cost of 50 or 150 or 200 basic food commodities with wages. So, all through the Government, various agencies are doing the same thing, although one could do the whole job and transmit its findings to the others.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask a question right there.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is true there are duplications, and that there are many agencies that are overlapping in some of the work which is being performed, but I should like the Senator from Maryland or the Senator from Tennessee to tell me why this particular agency was picked out for a reduction in its appropriations instead of some other?

Mr. McKELLAR. This was the first one before us; we did not have the others before us in this bill. I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, I am undertaking to reduce all unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. TOBEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to read that one of the objectives is to study thrift.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My understanding is that the Senator from Tennessee prefers a little more thrift now and a little less study of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that would be wise. I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the Scriptures back him up in his efforts, for therein is the injunction, "Avoid vain repetition."

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is fine to quote the Scriptures in this case, but if they were quoted more frequently in the Senate probably the country would be better off.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I should like to add to what the Senator from Maryland has said that last night I examined a statement filed for the Inland Steel Co. in connection with the application of their organized labor for an increase in wages, and there I found a most complete statement of wages in every line of industry in this country.

Mr. TYDINGS. By whom was it made? Was it made by the Labor Department?

Mr. REED. It was made by a professor of economics in the University of Chicago, and introduced on behalf of the Inland Steel Co., but it was a very complete statement based upon the research of the Bureau of Labor and the National Industrial Conference Board. Studies of

that kind are being made all the time. Why in the world should this figurehead of a body that has performed no useful service that I have ever heard of, go ahead wasting their time and the taxpayers' money as has been pointed out by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Already they have made a report which is contained in a large volume which must have cost a great deal of money.

I quote further from Dr. Merriam. The Board would also investigate—

The right to adequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care.

Each one is a duplication of research work that is now being made.

4. The right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, dependency, sickness, unemployment, and accident.

I take it there cannot be any doubt that we have reports from various departments on each one of those items.

6. The right to come and go, to speak or to be silent, free from the spyings of secret political police.

At a time such as this, when we need money so badly to defend ourselves against the two most warlike nations that ever existed upon the face of the earth, I do not think we ought to be spending the Government's money for such purposes as to conduct research into "the right to come and go, to speak or to be silent." We ourselves ought to be the judges of such things.

7. The right to equality before the law, with equal access to justice in fact.

That might be postponed for a little while. I am sure we should not appropriate the people's money for such a purpose at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. In just a moment. The next item is:

8. The right to education, for work, for citizenship, and for personal growth and happiness.

O Mr. President, how far are we to go in this research? Why should we spend the people's money on such research?

At first I thought it would be better to strike out the whole appropriation as unnecessary, but out of abundance of caution, so as not to do anything contrary to the best interests of the country, we reduced the appropriation, and I think what we have recommended should remain. I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has anticipated what I was about to suggest. I think it would be very wholesome if a motion were made now to strike out the whole appropriation. Certainly a strong case has not been made for the appropriation. The activity is full of duplications and, after all, half a million dollars is not to be sneezed at.

Mr. McKELLAR. We cut the appropriation down to \$400,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I entertain precisely the same thought the Senator from Maryland has expressed. Unless the chairman of the subcommittee, hav-

ing the bill in charge, feels it unwise, I shall make the motion to strike out the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not do that. Whatever may be said of our committee and of any of its members, we have tried to do our conscientious, patriotic duty in eliminating expenditures which we regarded as unnecessary. I am sure there is not a man within the sound of my voice who has heard the debate today, who would not say that at least the reduction we have recommended should be agreed to. I hope the Senator from Kansas will go along with the committee, because we have tried to be conservative, we have tried to be reasonable, and we desire to do the right thing.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, let us vote on the amendment, and stop talking about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, and I shall be glad to have a vote, if the Senate is willing.

Mr. REED. I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that, of course, I shall go along with the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. REED. I usually do. However, unless the committee thinks it unwise, I stand ready to make a motion to strike out the whole appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can understand the Senator's view about the matter, but I hope he will go along with the committee. I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, on page 5, line 4, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 5, line 4, after the word "expenses," to insert "not to exceed \$50,000."

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hill	Reynolds
Bankhead	Holman	Rosier
Barbour	Hughes	Russell
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brown	Kilgore	Smathers
Bulow	La Follette	Smith
Bunker	Lee	Spencer
Burton	Lucas	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Taft
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McKellar	Tobey
Caraway	Maloney	Tunnell
Chandler	Maybank	Tydings
Chavez	Mead	Vandenberg
Danaher	Millikin	Van Nuys
Davis	Murdock	Wallgren
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, on page 5, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 5, line 14, after the word "laws", to strike out "\$668,845" and insert "\$400,000", a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of the funds appropriated under this item shall be used for the performance of any functions or duties other than the functions heretofore authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MURDOCK (when the name of Mr. THOMAS of Utah was called). It is with very deep and sincere regret that I announce the absence from the Senate today, of my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], because of the unexpected and sudden death of Mrs. Thomas last evening. He has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in Government departments.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained in committee meetings. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is detained on business of the Senate. He is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] on this question. If present, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 20, not voting 23, as follows:

YEAS—53

Andrews	George	Radcliffe
Austin	Gerry	Reed
Bailey	Gillette	Reynolds
Ball	Glass	Russell
Bankhead	Gurney	Shipstead
Barbour	Holman	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bunker	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	Lucas	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McKellar	Tobey
Capper	Maloney	Tunnell
Chandler	Maybank	Tydings
Chavez	Mead	Vandenberg
Davis	Millikin	Van Nuys
Doxey	O'Daniel	Willis
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—20

Alken	Hughes	Nye
Barkley	La Follette	Pepper
Bilbo	Lee	Rosier
Caraway	McFarland	Schwartz
Danaher	Murdoch	Wallgren
Green	Murray	Wiley
Hill	Norris	

NOT VOTING—23

Bone	Guffey	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Hatch	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Hayden	Truman
Brooks	Herring	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Lodge	Wheeler
Connally	McNary	White
Downey	Overton	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 20, to strike out:

National-defense activities: For expenses necessary for the planning activities of the National Resources Planning Board in the interest of national defense, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase of books of reference and periodicals; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with development, conservation, and use of the resources of the Nation; traveling expenses; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board; purchase of office equipment and supplies without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes when the amount involved in any case does not exceed \$50, and not to exceed \$100,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to said section 3709, or classification laws, \$400,000, of which not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available for printing and binding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Government Reports," on page 7, line 3, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "\$1,475,000" and insert "\$1,075,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 8, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$18,730."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to insert:

The appropriations herein made for the Office of Government Reports shall not be

supplemented by funds from any source aggregating in excess of \$600,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, at the end of line 13, to reduce the total appropriation for the Executive Office of the President, from \$5,135,325 to \$4,060,210.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 11, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$7,500"; in line 16, after the word "examinations" and the semicolon, to insert "not to exceed \$130,356 for"; in line 18, after the word "Commission", to insert a comma and "and including actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of members of the Board of Legal Examiners serving as such while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States"; on page 12, line 17, after the word "stamps" and the semicolon, to strike out "\$5,861,527" and insert "\$5,000,000", and on page 13, line 14, after the word "force", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation in this act shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Legal Examiners created in the Civil Service Commission by Executive Order No. 8743 of April 23, 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 14, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert "traveling expenses not to exceed \$412,020"; and in line 17, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$7,491,908" and insert "\$7,446,128."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, at the end of line 17, to reduce the total appropriation for the Civil Service Commission from \$120,195,935 to \$119,288,628.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 18, to strike out:

THE ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY

The unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, of the "Conversion of inhabited alleys funds," established pursuant to the provisions of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, together with all accretions during the fiscal year 1943 to said fund under the provisions of said act and of the United States Housing Act of 1937, shall be available until June 30, 1943, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of said District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee make some explanation of the committee amendment beginning in line 19, on page 15, and ending in line 2, on page 16.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say, Mr. President, that I have a letter from the president of the Washington Housing Association expressing regret that this amendment was reported by the committee. Not having been present at the time the matter was discussed, I should be happy to have the Senator explain it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to give the facts about this matter. The

Senator from Wyoming will remember that the Alley Dwelling Authority was created several years ago, and has built a great many houses in alleys—about 85 in all, as I remember. I may be mistaken as to the number. Those buildings cost the Government \$865,000—not quite \$1,000,000. The Alley Dwelling Authority has completed its job, insofar as the alley dwellings are concerned. They are not building any more houses. They are collecting the rents and making repairs. After the committee had struck out this item, officers of the Alley Dwelling Authority came to the committee and made the statement that they would collect this year in the neighborhood of \$50,000 rent, and they had on hand about \$90,000. One of the arguments they made was that this work did not cost the Government anything at all. They said they did not know why the Congress should be interested in the matter because it did not cost the Government anything.

I asked one of the officers what he thought about the Government's interest in the \$865,000 it had invested. He said he had not considered that. It is simply the case of the Authority having run away with the idea that it should have control of this matter, and that there is no use to interfere with it.

Mr. President, it developed, however, that there was a real necessity for the retention of three persons, I believe, one with a salary of about \$2,500, and two others with salaries of \$1,500 each. The Authority has one man actually in control of one apartment house, to whom they pay \$1,500, and he ought to be retained. They have another apartment house in which a part-time man is kept. After discussing the matter with the officers of the Authority, it was thought that three men should be retained. I cannot say that the representatives of the Authority agreed, because they wanted to retain the whole business. They wanted to use \$90,000 to collect, say, \$60,000 in rents, but, in the opinion of the committee, that was not necessary. I think, however, that the committee probably should not have stricken out the whole provision but should have allowed for the three clerks, whose salaries will amount to about \$5,500, and then the balance, amounting to \$12,000 in all, for improvement, repairs, or matters of that kind. I am quite sure that would be satisfactory to everybody. While I am not authorized by the committee to offer this amendment, on my own behalf I should like to offer a substitute so that the collection of the rents may be carried on and they can be paid into the Treasury of the United States as general receipts.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. That seems to me to be quite satisfactory.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Did the representatives of the agency give any specific reasons why they thought they ought to have the unexpended balance, aside from the argument that the Government was not interested? Did they give any reasons?

Mr. McKELLAR. Their reason was that they had been doing some defense-housing work locally—surveying and other things—and they wanted to continue it. I do not know whether they can continue it, or whether they have the right to do so. However, if the amendment which I have suggested is agreed to, the rents can be collected and paid into the Treasury of the United States as general receipts. That ought to be done. With the explanation I have made, I take the liberty of offering an amendment to take the place of the matter proposed to be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, after line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

THE ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY

For the maintenance and operation of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority Act, \$12,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources after July 1, 1942, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, of the "Conversion of Inhabited Alleys Fund," established pursuant to such act, shall also be covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. Do I correctly understand that the amendment just agreed to relates to the collection of rents on the buildings erected with the first \$865,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that the Alley Dwelling Authority has a great many operations not relating to that particular project and that it will require considerably more than \$12,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The other activities will not be affected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Communications Commission", on page 16, line 17, after the word "services", to insert a comma and "traveling expenses not to exceed \$52,110"; on page 17, line 12, after the word "thereunder", to strike out "\$2,300,000" and insert "\$2,000,000", and in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,401,500" and insert "\$1,218,260."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 20, after the word "expenses", to insert a comma and "including not to exceed \$112,140 for traveling expenses," and on page 18, line 10, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$2,667,619."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, at the end of line 13, to reduce the total

appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission from \$4,991,219 to \$4,678,759.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee who is the Goodwin Watson who is mentioned specifically on page 18?

Mr. McKELLAR. We are now considering committee amendments. The subject of the Senator's inquiry will not come up until later, if any Senator should care to bring it up. As I understand, the House inserted the provision referred to because of evidence that Mr. Watson was a Communist, and that the House had tried in other ways to get rid of him, but could not do so. It, therefore, inserted this provision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not wish to go into the question out of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. We can consider it later. I have the record before me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Loan Agency—Office of the Administrator", on page 18, line 21, after the numerals "1939", to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$241,575"; on page 19, line 1, after the word "periodicals" and the semicolon, to strike out "newspapers (not exceeding \$500); not exceeding \$1,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies or associations concerned with the furtherance of the work of the Agency, when specifically authorized by the Administrator"; and in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Electric Home and Farm Authority," on page 20, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$150,000."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, as I understand, the Electric Home and Farm Authority is in process of liquidation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. HILL. It has been in process of liquidation for 6 or 8 months, has it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. Mr. Jones, the head of this activity, has an amendment which I had intended to suggest if the committee amendment should be agreed to. The suggested amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That necessary expenses in collecting monthly installments on contracts and repossessing appliances in case of default, not to exceed \$2.50 per year per contract, shall not be considered as administrative expenses.

Mr. HILL. That is the very matter about which I wished to ask the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I expect to offer that amendment when the matter comes up.

Mr. HILL. This agency has a surplus in its funds. It is not taking any money out of the Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is just another one of those cases—

Mr. HILL. Is the statement as to a surplus true or not?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is just another one of those cases in which the manager of an activity which is making money says, "We are paying our expenses out of our income. The Congress ought not to be bothered about that." In times like these we have to bother about such things in order to keep the Government running properly.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator. I think the Senator's suggested amendment would make it possible for this agency to collect the money which it is now collecting in a more businesslike and efficient way than without the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Jones prepared it, and I believe he is correct, because he is a very able businessman. That is the reason I intend to offer the amendment when we get to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 20, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 23, to strike out:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Export-Import Bank of Washington, administrative expenses: Not to exceed \$270,535 of the funds of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, established as an agency of the Government by Executive Order No. 6581 of February 2, 1934, and continued as such agency until January 22, 1947, by the act approved January 31, 1935, as amended by the act of September 26, 1940 (Public, No. 792), shall be available during the fiscal year 1943 for all administrative expenses of the bank, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821-833); printing and binding, lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed \$500 for periodicals, newspapers, and maps; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; not to exceed \$25,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations for special services by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; transfer of household goods and effects, as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; rent in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That all necessary expenses (including special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the bank or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Home Loan Bank Board", on page 22, line 11, before the word "travel", to insert "not to exceed \$189,000 for"; on page 23, line 5, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$1,500,938" and insert "\$1,250,000"; and in line 15, after the word "hereof", and the colon, to strike out "*Provided further*, That except for the limitations in amounts hereinbefore specified, and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses,

the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1421-1449)" and insert "*Provided further*, That such sum shall be so apportioned and distributed by the Board over the fiscal year 1943, and shall be so administered during such fiscal year, as to (1) constitute the total amount that will be required for such expenses during such fiscal year and (2) prevent expenditures which will necessitate making additional sums available for such expenses during such year; and a failure to comply with the requirements of this proviso shall be deemed to be a violation by each member of the Board, and by any other person responsible for such failure, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Housing Administration", on page 24, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$15,041,343" and insert "\$14,621,499"; and in line 19, after the word "elsewhere", to insert "not to exceed \$759,376 for."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment on page 24, line 8, which reduces the total amount of money appropriated for the Federal Housing Administration by some \$400,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to explain it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to talk to the Senator about that amendment, in connection with the amendment in line 19 on the same page, and also the amendment on page 26, line 14.

I have no desire to oppose the amendment in lines 8 and 9 on page 24, where the total amount of the appropriation has been reduced; but I think that the reduction has been made in the wrong place, according to the information which I have received from the Federal Housing Administration.

The Senator will observe that in line 19 on page 24 there is a provision that not to exceed \$759,376 for traveling expenses shall be appropriated out of the \$14,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct. We made a 20-percent reduction.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. The Federal Housing Administration advises me that while it would be greatly handicapped if a 20-percent reduction were made, a 10-percent reduction would not seriously interfere with its activities, for this reason: The Senator realizes that Congress has by law increased the per diem allowance for subsistence from \$5 to \$6. Also the Interstate Commerce Commission has authorized a 10-percent increase in railroad fares, which must be paid by those who travel for this agency as well as by others.

The Housing Administration feels that it can save enough in other places in its appropriation to avoid asking for the restoration of the House figure, but that the attempt of the committee to save out of traveling expenses would handicap it because of the increase in the per diem

subsistence allowance made by Congress and because of the increase in railroad fares under the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I was about to suggest to the Senator that, instead of the \$759,376, which would represent a 20-percent reduction, he agree to a figure of \$854,296, which would represent a 10-percent reduction. It would not result in an increase of the total appropriation, but it would take into account the increase in the per diem allowance and also the increase in the railroad rates necessarily paid by those who travel. I think that would be a fair adjustment of the matter. I hope the Senator from Tennessee may accept the suggestion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that we have consolidated 8 or 10 housing agencies.

Mr. TYDINGS. Sixteen of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. There were 8 or 10 large ones, and some smaller ones. Undoubtedly they ought to be able to get along with less travel pay and less expenses of all kinds. That consolidation took place after the bill was under consideration. We could let the matter go to conference and have the head of the department come before us. If there is a real reason for not making the proposed reduction, perhaps some other arrangement can be made; but rather than have this item put in jeopardy in conference, it would be better to let it go in as it is.

There is another reason: The Senator understands that every department and agency of the Government is objecting to any reduction of its travel pay. They are objecting to any reduction in what the House has allowed them, or what they have heretofore been receiving. So we want to treat all alike; and I do not think we should undertake to make distinctions.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the House has passed a bill, purely for war purposes, increasing from \$300,000,000 to \$800,000,000 the authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans. That has been done in order to induce the utilization of private capital for the building of houses in defense areas, in order that the Government itself will not have to build such houses.

I have before me a letter from the city of Henderson, Ky., where a defense plant is located. The situation there is only typical of the situation elsewhere. Nearly 200 families will be brought into Henderson because of the defense plant located there. There is not a vacant house in Henderson to house any of the 200 families. Someone has to build the needed houses. We do not want the Government to do that if it can be avoided. The House has passed a bill—and I think tomorrow the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency will report it to the Senate—increasing by \$500,000,000 the authority of the Federal Housing Administration—purely for war purposes; we should keep that in mind. That will not mean taking any money out of the Treasury. As a matter of fact, the Federal Housing Administration has been one of the agencies which have made

money. It has turned back and is turning back money into the Treasury. It does not pay out any money from the Treasury. It does not build houses; it insures.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it has paid any money back into the Treasury.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not sure about the bookkeeping. At any rate, the Federal Housing Administration is making a profit from its operations. It insures the loans. It does not invest any money in building houses.

In order to accommodate the influx of population in defense areas, so declared by the Government of the United States, it is desirable to induce the investment of private capital in the construction of houses in scores of communities throughout the country in order to take care of defense housing problems. The House has passed a bill, which I think will be reported tomorrow by the Committee on Banking and Currency, increasing by \$500,000,000 the authority of the Federal Housing Administration—not the United States Housing Authority, but the F. H. A., with which all of us are familiar. In other words, the bill makes provision for it to insure the construction of houses, for war purposes only, to the extent of \$500,000,000 more than it now has the authority to insure.

Of course, I do not know what the Senate will do with that bill, but I presume the Senate will pass it. The bill was passed practically unanimously by the House, and I think it will be reported to the Senate tomorrow.

If the bill is passed, it will mean that the Federal Housing Administration will have to increase by about 160 percent its operations in the insurance of housing facilities in the country. Of course, that will mean that it will have to widen its activities. I realize that a lump sum of nine-hundred-thousand-odd dollars, which is the amount which the Bureau of the Budget recommended in this bill for travel expenses, sounds like a very large amount; and yet the Federal Housing Administration must bring information to the residents of communities and cities, as well as to private capital which we are seeking to induce to enter upon the construction of houses in the defense areas so that we shall not have to provide money out of the Treasury for the construction of such houses.

In view of the increase we have made in the allowance for per diem subsistence—an increase from \$5 a day to \$6 a day, which is a 20-percent increase—and in view of the increased cost of transportation throughout the country, it seems to me that a compromise of a 10-percent reduction is fair. Either that must be done or the agencies must make an unusual curtailment in the traveling expenses of their agents and representatives. Such men must go to the various communities and take information to the people interested in housing projects. Among all the agencies which have been set up by the Government, I think the Federal Housing Administration has been one of the most useful and successful. It is not now costing the Government anything out-of-pocket. It is paying its own way. The proposed reduction

would really amount to a reduction in the amount which the Federal Housing Administration might spend out of its own revenue, and not out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator has fallen into the same error into which all the bureaus have fallen. They say that if they are in charge of an activity which is making money there is no cost to the Government. They contend that they are making money and that they should be free to spend what they please out of it. I cannot agree to that argument.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not accept that suggestion.

I know how easy it is to condemn someone by calling him a bureaucrat. I do not think the officials of the Federal Housing Administration can be brought within that category. I am now talking only about the item for traveling expenses. I know that in my own State—and I presume every Senator knows this to be true as to his own State—from the beginning until now it has been necessary for the Federal Housing Administration to bring information to the attention of those who are interested in the construction of houses. In the first place, information had to be brought to those who desired to build houses. They had to be told how they could proceed—borrow the money from a bank or from some lending institution which in turn would be insured by the Federal Housing Administration against losses of certain types. Operating under that cooperative plan of the F. H. A., the banks, and the individuals, they got into the business of construction of houses.

All of that requires education; it requires personal contacts; it requires a description of the plan—not only or necessarily by pamphlets and advertisements in newspapers but by little group meetings which are being held and were held and may again be held in communities, especially communities in the defense areas; I know of scores of communities in which are being built plants for the construction and manufacture of tanks, airplanes, powder, synthetic rubber, and other commodities necessary for winning this war—communities in which, in order to induce the utilization of private capital for the building of such houses, it is necessary to advise the persons interested in undertaking such construction of the procedure, of their rights, and of the results of their operations. Otherwise, the Government will have to pay for the building of such houses, and we shall be called upon for an appropriation for that purpose.

I think it is extremely desirable that private capital be induced to enter that construction field; and that is what the item under discussion is intended to facilitate.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The Senator has overlooked another necessity for travel expenses; and that is that when houses are built the loans have to be insured

by the Government, and before they are built an inspector must go out to see that the site selected is in a proper part of town, so that the risk will be a safe one. Also inspectors are required to ascertain that the houses have been built. So a very large part of the expense is directly incurred in protection of the Government in its capacity as an insurer of loans in connection with the building of such houses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly that is true. Let me point out an example. A few moments ago I mentioned Henderson, Ky., where a year ago the Government located an ammonia plant, to be built by the Allied Chemical & Dye Co., and to be paid for out of the funds of the United States Government, under a contract. As I say, the plant will be operated by the Allied Chemical & Dye Co. Henderson is a city of approximately 20,000 persons. The plant was located there because Henderson is close to the coal fields. The coal is carried in barges down the Ohio River and unloaded on the banks of the river. The site selected was chosen because of the easy access to the plant itself. The ammonia is made from a certain type of coal, which is obtained in eastern Kentucky and in western West Virginia.

It was located there because of its proximity to the raw materials and because of the cheap transportation; but that community was not prepared to house the extra employees to be brought there in order to operate this institution.

Under the housing bill which is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is to meet tomorrow on that bill, if they report it, \$500,000,000 could be added to the insurance authority of the Federal Housing Administration. Obviously, its employees will have to do more traveling in order to inspect these housing facilities and in order to carry them on.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment. In order to provide the insurance that they have been providing heretofore, and in view of the increased possibility of activity on the part of the F. H. A., it seems to me that a 10-percent reduction is not an unreasonable figure on the side either of the committee or of the F. H. A. I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think if the Senator's premise were correct, his reasoning would be unanswerable, but I do not believe the Senator has the true picture of the increased activities of the Federal Housing Authority.

The Federal Government has stopped all private building. The priorities situation has interfered with the building of new homes. One has to obtain priorities before he can secure material with which to build a new home.

Mr. BARKLEY. That does not apply to any of these defense areas, though.

Mr. TYDINGS. As a matter of fact, the evidence shows that there is less building going on in the United States today, notwithstanding defense home building, with the private building of

homes being curtailed, than there was with the building of private homes going at full blast a year or two ago, and there was no defense housing activity in the picture.

So I do not believe the Senator's conception of the facts is an accurate one. If what he said were true, and presented a true picture, naturally there would be greater need for travel allowance, but the fact is that when individual or a group of small individuals' homes were insured in this or that locality, it took more inspection, because there was no uniformity to the operation, whereas when the Government enters on a housing proposition there is a certain amount of uniformity about it, and when one house is insured on an approved plan they are all insured, because they are more or less all the same, whether as to facade, chimney, windows or what not. So that private building per se, the building of homes for civilian populations in New York or Buffalo or Baltimore or Washington or wherever it may be, is practically at a standstill; but there is a great deal of building of homes in defense areas where they are needed. Therefore, as there are fewer homes being built than under the former dispensation, it stands to reason that there is less money needed for travel mileage.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is true, as the Senator has said, that the activities of the War Production Board have curtailed the building of private houses by private individuals, as a rule, but that very situation has been brought about because of the necessity of building more houses in some communities in order to shelter persons who are engaged in national defense work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it might be more in keeping with the facts to say that a part of it has been caused by the building of defense homes. The real reason for the shortage in the building of private homes is that wiring, certain forms of steel, heating plants, and many other items that go into private homes, are no longer available to the purchasing public, but are only available in defense activities. That is the reason the building of private homes has been curtailed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may have been too all-inclusive in my suggestion that the reason why we have curtailed the building of houses for private individuals is to concentrate upon the building of houses in defense areas, and I accept the suggestion that at least it is in part due to that situation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, with reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland, I should like to state that in certain communities one cannot get nails with which to build ordinary necessary structures even on the farm.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not dispute that at all; there is no controversy upon that

point, but there is one thing I do not think any of us can deny and that is that in the areas where plants have been constructed or are now under construction for the production of war materials, where the local housing facilities are not sufficient to accommodate the people who will be brought there to manufacture indispensable war materials, either private capital must build the houses or the Government of the United States must build them.

We cannot establish in a particular location a \$30,000,000 plant for the manufacture of TNT or powder or aluminum or tanks or anything else and put people out on the streets; they have got to have housing accommodations. If such accommodations do not exist in the community, they must be built by someone, and there are only two sources from which the money can be derived to build such housing accommodations: One is the Government of the United States—and we want to avoid that, if it is possible—and the other is private capital.

While it is true that building has been curtailed and almost completely eliminated for ordinary purposes throughout the country, I think we are bound to admit that building facilities must be accelerated in the communities where there is a new defense activity moving—where a factory is to be established. I have in mind several places—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment. I have in mind several places—one or two in the State of Tennessee, one or two in the State of Kentucky, and one or two in the State of Mississippi—where because of the geographical location, transportation, and other considerations there have been established very extensive plants for the manufacture of certain products necessary to the war. Such plants are being erected in communities where there are absolutely no housing facilities whatever; some of them in communities in rural sections where, in the nearest town proximate to the location, there must be additional housing facilities provided. We must either build them by the Government or offer some inducement to private capital to construct them. This is one of the ways. While the housing agencies have been consolidated, construction of houses by private capital in these defense areas is yet under the jurisdiction of the Federal Housing Administration, in order to avoid expenditure out of the Treasury, so that their activities have not only not been curtailed but will be increased. That is why the Congress is, in the next few days, going to pass a bill increasing their authority to insure housing loans by about \$500,000,000. It is obviously necessary that the representatives of the Federal Housing Administration should go into those communities to contact personally those who will be interested in putting their own money into such housing. Therefore, I do not think that a 20-percent decrease in the traveling expenses of these employees is justified, but I do think that a 10-percent reduction would be fair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to state two things to the Senator. First, under the priorities now being enforced by the War Production Board, even the building of a high school has been prohibited for the time being because of the lack of steel and other commodities which the Government needs more vitally for the war effort. I know that to be true. The second thing I should like to say to the Senator is that if we adopt his amendment and go to conference the margin which the conferees can consider will be between no reduction and a 10-percent reduction; but if we take the committee amendment and go to conference, the margin before the conferees will be between the committee's 20 percent and nothing.

I wish to say to the Senator that, as one of the conferees, if the Federal housing bill shall come before us, as I assume it will, and if more mileage money is needed than the committee amendment provides, I shall be glad to support an increase; but with private building stopped pretty much over the country because of the shortage of furnaces, of electric wiring, nails, and other materials, I do not believe, in the total picture, as much building will be done for the whole Nation as was done before we had the priority system, which made building material not available. I will be glad to carry out that agreement in good faith.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize, of course, that there is a wider margin in conference where there is a 20-percent reduction than where there is a 10-percent reduction, but I wish the Senator would keep in mind that this suggestion in no way changes the reduction in the total amount. The Federal Housing Administration feel that while they can undergo a saving of four-hundred-odd thousand dollars, it has been provided in the wrong place.

The Senate committee has recommended a reduction of the appropriation of \$15,041,343 provided by the House to \$14,621,499, and out of this item has provided that not to exceed \$759,376 may be paid for traveling expenses; and another item, on page 26, involving \$180,000, has been stricken out. The officials of the Housing Authority say they can make saving enough somewhere else to take care of the reduction without a total increase in the appropriation that has been provided by the committee.

I wish the Senator from Tennessee and other members of the committee would accept the suggestion and take it to conference. It does not involve any total increase; it merely involves a shift of the saving in the two items in the bill to some other activity in which they can make up enough in savings to take care of the increase I have suggested.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Ferguson, the head of this activity came to see me about the matter and told me frankly what the Senator has stated here today. By the way, I wish to say for Mr. Ferguson that he is one of the most pleasant gentlemen I ever met.

Mr. BARKLEY. And a very competent administrator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I imagine he is. I should judge so from the way he talked and the way he acted. He seemed to be a very conservative man and a very reasonable man. I was impressed with him.

The best way to handle this matter is to let it go to conference, and let us work it out there; and I told Mr. Ferguson that if it came to a vote in the Senate and the Senate voted against it, the conferees' hands would be tied. If it goes to conference as it is, their hands will not be tied, but we can work out a reasonable proposal between the two Houses. I wish to ask the Senator from Kentucky, as the majority leader, to let the provision go as it is, and let us work out a reasonable proposal.

I was very much impressed with the attitude, with the demeanor, with the ability, and with the sincerity of purpose of Mr. Ferguson. I am rather inclined to think that there was something in what he had to say, but I think the matter should go to conference, and I wish the Senator would let it take that course.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Kentucky made the statement a moment ago that a bill with regard to housing would soon be presented before the Senate. He had reference, of course, to the F. H. A. bill about to be reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The hearings on that bill have just been completed. The committee will meet tomorrow morning, and every reasonable effort will be made to expedite the passage of the bill.

The members of the committee have become convinced from the hearings that the necessity for the building of houses is imperative. It is useless to employ workers if there are not suitable and convenient homes in which they can live with adequate transportation facilities. Some of the large industrial plants now being built, like the one in Michigan, for instance, are built on the prairies, and it is absolutely essential that houses for that plant should be erected and should be erected quickly, preferably by private, not public, funds. I think it would be a pity for the Senate to impose any unnecessary restrictions. I am satisfied that Mr. Blandford, Mr. Ferguson, and their associates are going to be careful and efficient in these matters, and I certainly would not at this time impose any restrictions which are not obviously necessary.

Whether the Housing Authority will have to spend a large amount or a small amount for traveling, I do not know, and no one else can know at this moment, but we must realize that the Housing Administration has a big problem to work out. Their problem is a vital one, and they must get to work on it as quickly and effectively as possible.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and who is practically in charge of the proposed legislation.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am in charge of the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for his remarks, because he confirms what I suggested a moment ago, that in all probability that bill will be reported tomorrow by the committee, and I think it will pass the Senate. It will increase the authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans by about \$500,000,000.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from Tennessee and of the Senator from Maryland. I always like to support the action of a committee when I can. I feel that that is my duty here, so far as I can do it; but when I am brought face to face with a situation such as that now confronting us, I realize that no person has the last word, that no one is infallible, and that no committee is infallible on this subject.

If the Senator from Tennessee will accept the amendment—I am in a compromising mood—while I personally should prefer the \$854,000 instead of \$759,000, because it involves no increase, that representing a 10-percent decrease instead of the 20 percent carried by the committee, without taking time to figure out the exact amount in dollars, would the Senator accept a 15-percent reduction, instead of 20 percent?

Mr. McKELLAR. Personally, I should have no objection to that. Is the chairman of the committee agreeable to the suggestion?

Mr. GLASS. We are spending the difference in talk. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to insert the exact figure, which we can supply a moment later, I suggest the amendment.

Would the Senator be willing to agree to an amendment on page 26, where the committee has eliminated altogether \$180,000 where I had suggested that \$100,000 be substituted instead?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is for propaganda purposes; it is for advertising. I do not know why this instrumentality of the Government should engage in that activity. We will take it to conference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Eighty thousand dollars of it would go to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. When we get a little further on in the bill we will find what "public relations" really means. "Public relations" means a propaganda service for certain officials. I hope the Senator will not make a request for that. I am willing to accept the 15 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee has made a hundred percent reduction in this item.

Mr. McKELLAR. It should be that; the activity never should have been permitted. The idea of the Housing Authority having to spend \$180,000 for advertising what it is doing. It is a wasteful extravagance, and it should not be allowed.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee has eliminated in the amendment on page 26 \$50,000 which has been allocated by law to the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not been allocated by law; the money has to be appropriated, and our committee did not agree to appropriate it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Fifty thousand dollars has been carried in the appropriations to enable the Bureau of Standards to make investigations and standardize projects under the Federal Housing Administration, upon the request of the Administrator. So that would still leave only \$50,000 available, instead of \$180,000, for carrying on educational work in the District of Columbia by the F. H. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Educational work. It is nothing in the world but propaganda and advertising.

Mr. BARKLEY. "Propaganda" is a broad term.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps "advertising" is not so broad.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator and I indulge in a good deal of propaganda when we go out into the country and make speeches for something in which we believe.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are indulging in some now.

Mr. BARKLEY. The difference is that the Senator's propaganda and my propaganda are always wise and legitimate and proper, whereas propaganda on the part of others may be questioned.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was about to point out to the Senator from Kentucky that this matter should go to conference, for the reason, as he himself has stated—and I think he is well within the facts—that the principal part of the building that is to be done hereafter is to be defense building, in connection with defense plants. It is really a governmental activity. The need for propaganda and the need for advertising, which existed before the war, when private individuals were building homes, and we wanted to encourage home building, has disappeared. So that \$180,000 is not needed to tell the people about it today, because they cannot get the materials with which to build, even if we should tell them.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Maryland having agreed to the 15-percent proposition in the other amendment, if this amendment shall go to conference with the \$180,000 for information and educational purposes, will Mr. Ferguson and other representatives of the F. H. A. be permitted to present the matter to the conference?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be very glad to have them do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I, myself, might desire to go before the committee in an informal way.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be glad to have the matter handled in that way.

Mr. BARKLEY. With that understanding, I shall not press the amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I think it is a good idea that the conferees get together on these items, because I am sure, from what I have learned of the situation, that our conception of education and propaganda is entirely erroneous. The educational work the Housing Administration is doing is very essential, and directly connected with the national defense, because of priority orders and limitations and restrictions on construction of homes. The Housing Administration is educating the people on the construction of homes by the use of substitute materials and equipment not within the banned categories. I believe they are doing an excellent job, and, in view of the fact that they turned over a surplus of \$13,000,000 as a result of their educational work, I believe they really should be encouraged.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Federal Housing Administration has done a good job in the matter of educating the people, and coming in contact with them. It is not propaganda in the disagreeable and offensive sense in which we use that term. We know that the average person, even the average bank, the average lending agency in this country, does not know all the intricacies and the finesse of cooperating in the making of these loans. Many of them do now, because of experience in the operation of the F. H. A. It is not an offensive effort; the Federal Housing Administration is not going out with a lot of ballyhoo in an attempt to sell insurance on loans. It is merely educating people as to their rights and banks as to their obligations and the way in which they can cooperate to facilitate these housing activities.

In this connection, Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a brief two-page résumé of the activities of the Federal Housing Administration on these two points, as well as the reasons advanced for retaining at least a part of the appropriation proposed by the committee to be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A competent information service is essential to the effective functioning of the Federal Housing Administration, now engaged chiefly in providing housing for workers in war industries.

This is especially true at this time, when the Federal Housing Administration program is expected to provide the bulk of the 200,000 houses recently allocated by the War Production Board for construction by private industry with private capital.

At this very moment the Senate is about to begin consideration of the bill, already passed unanimously by the House, to enable the Federal Housing Administration to put this war housing program into effect through title VI of the National Housing Act.

This bill is designed to encourage the production of thousands of houses for war workers by private industry and private capital operating under the Federal Housing Administration program without further burdening the Treasury at this time.

Yet, if the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee is sustained, the Federal Housing Administration would be unable to spend, out of its own revenue, one nickel to inform the country how to make use of this vitally important measure. Nor would such action save any money for the Government's war expenditure, since the funds involved would not revert to the Treasury but would simply be tied up in the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, of which the Government, through the Federal Housing Administration Commissioner, is only the custodian.

It should be borne in mind that the National Housing Act is not self-operating. It has no compulsory features. The Federal Housing Administration cannot compel anyone to operate within the provisions of the act. Its successful operation depends upon the wholly voluntary cooperation of all elements in the home-construction industry, in home financing, and by the public generally. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to obtain this cooperation without continuing information and educational work so that those who use the law may be kept informed of action by Congress on amendments and of changes in rules, regulations, and policy, especially under the rapidly fluctuating conditions of the war.

The Public Relations and Educational Divisions were set up as the most effective and economical means of carrying on this necessary work. They are expending their energies, not in broadcasting high-pressure selling ballyhoo but entirely in the preparation and dissemination of information deemed necessary to the successful administration of the acts of Congress.

These two Divisions save money for the Administration for two principal reasons:

1. They concentrate the preparation and dissemination of information in the hands of trained experts and thus relieve other officials who, because of their lack of experience, probably would do it less competently.
2. By placing proper information before interested groups, particularly builders and home-financing institutions, they eliminate, at the source, much unnecessary work, especially in the submission of faulty applications which have to be rejected. (Rejected applications are always costly to the Administration.)

The Federal Housing Administration is an organization with 4,500 employees and some \$5,000,000,000 of insurance on its books. An agency of such dimensions within the Government, doing business in every part of the United States, cannot hermetically seal itself against public inquiry. Even if all further expansion were suspended for the duration of the war, questions about it would be asked constantly, and the best facility for answering such questions is a trained informational service of the kind maintained by the Federal Housing Administration, which costs less than 1 percent of the Federal Housing Administration's budget.

Mr. MEAD. I feel sure that the appropriations will be retained, in some part, at least, if the agreement suggested by the majority leader shall be carried out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on page 24, line 19, I submit an amendment to the committee amendment, to strike out "\$759,376" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$806,837."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Kentucky that the committee amendment on page 24, in lines 8 and 9, has not as yet been disposed of. When that shall have been agreed to, the Senator's amendment to the committee amendment will be in order.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 24, lines 8 and 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment on page 24, line 19.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out "\$759,376" and insert in lieu thereof "\$806,837."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 14, after "(12 U. S. C. 1701)", to strike out the colon and "Provided further, That not exceeding \$180,000 of the sum herein authorized shall be expended in the District of Columbia for purposes of the Public Relations and Education Division: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the amount made available hereby for administrative expenses may be transferred to the National Bureau of Standards to carry out specific projects of the Administration, upon the request of the Administrator, for studies of the properties and suitability of building materials with particular reference to their use in low-cost and low-rent housing, including the construction of such experimental structures as may be necessary therefor, and for printing, binding, and disseminating the results of such studies" and insert "": *Provided further*, That no part of the sum herein authorized shall be expended in the District of Columbia for the purposes of the Public Relations and Education Division."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corporation", on page 27, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$450,443" and insert "\$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Home Owners' Loan Corporation", on page 29, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$15,153,712" and insert "\$12,000,000"; in line 9, after the word "thereunder", to insert "not to exceed \$580,000 for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 6, after the word "hereof" and the colon, to strike out "Provided further, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the amount made available hereby for administrative expenses may be transferred to the National Bureau of Standards to carry out specific projects of the Corporation, upon its request, for studies of the properties and suitability of building materials, with particular reference to their use in low-cost and low-rent housing, including the construction of such experimental structures as may be necessary therefor,

and for printing, binding, and disseminating the results of such studies: *Provided further*, That except for the limitations in amounts hereinbefore specified, and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1461-1468)" and insert "*Provided further*, That such sum shall be so apportioned and distributed by the Board of Directors of the Corporation over the fiscal year 1943, and shall be so administered during such fiscal year, as to (1) constitute the total amount that will be required for such expenses during such fiscal year and (2) prevent expenditures which will necessitate making additional sums available for such expenses during such year; and a failure to comply with the requirements of this proviso shall be deemed to be a violation by each member of the Board, and by any other person responsible for such failure, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665): *Provided further*, That no part of the amount made available hereby for administrative expenses may be used for the maintenance of regional offices."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as I understood, with reference to the amendment on page 30, the Chief Clerk was reciting the proposed committee amendment to strike out beginning in line 6 and ending in line 21. Is my understanding correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, Mr. President, the next question would be on agreeing to the committee amendment commencing in line 21, on page 30, down to and including line 10 on page 31, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Am I correct in understanding that we have not yet acted on the language proposed to be inserted in the proposed amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Action has been taken on that language.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 30 beginning in line 9 and ending in line 10 on page 31 was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. As I read that proposed matter to be inserted, commencing in line 21, on page 30, down to and including the word "year", in line 3, page 31, it is a portion which may be divisible properly from the remaining portion, commencing in line 3, page 31, with the words "and a failure", down to and including line 10, on page 31. Is the language proposed to be inserted divisible?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the amendment is subject to amendment, and any portion of that language can be stricken out.

Mr. DANAHER. I then make a point of order against so much of the language as appears on page 31, beginning in line 3, and which reads—

and a failure to comply with the requirements of this proviso shall be deemed to be a violation by each member of the board, and by any other person responsible for such failure, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665)—

on the ground that it comprises legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, that is the point of order I make. I respectfully ask that the Chair not rule on the point of order at this time, but that action by the Chair be deferred until we shall have concluded the other committee amendments in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to that part of the language which was read by the Senator from Connecticut being stricken out.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I respectfully ask that the Chair not rule, if it may appropriately withhold a ruling, until the Senate shall have acted on the other committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as I am concerned, I am willing that the language read by the Senator be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If that is the point the Senator from Connecticut makes—

Mr. DANAHER. That is the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And if there is no objection by the Senator from Tennessee to that language being stricken out, the language will be stricken out.

Mr. DANAHER. If the Chair prefers to act at this time, very well; but I was simply asking that the Chair defer making the ruling at this time, until the remaining committee amendments shall have been acted upon. I wanted to have the point of order noted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment is amended by striking out the language read by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and, without objection, the committee amendment, as amended is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reconstruction Finance Corporation," on page 31, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$10,335,292" and insert "\$10,310,792"; in line 20, after "(5 U. S. C. 821-833)" to insert "not to exceed \$207,000"; and in line 22, after the word "reference", to strike out the comma and "and not to exceed \$1,500 for periodicals and newspapers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission—Salaries and Expenses," on page 33, line 1, after the word "including", to insert "not to exceed \$166,500 for"; in line 15, after the word "periodicals", to strike

out "\$2,303,125" and insert "\$2,000,000", and in line 16, before the words "shall be", to strike out "\$1,217,500" and insert "\$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 10, after the name "Federal Power Commission", to strike out "\$2,506,265" and insert "\$2,203,140."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, at the end of line 4, to reduce the total appropriation for the Federal Power Commission from \$3,067,520 to \$2,764,395.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission", on page 35, line 13, after the word "rentals", to insert "not to exceed \$124,380 for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 19, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$2,252,224" and insert "\$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, at the end of line 3, to reduce the total appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission from \$2,302,474 to \$2,050,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency—Public Buildings Administration", on page 38, line 10, after the word "services", to insert "not to exceed \$225,000 for"; in line 11, after the words "traveling expenses", to strike out "including expenses (not exceeding \$1,000) of employees directed by the Federal Works Administrator to attend meetings of technical and professional societies and educational exhibits in connection with subjects related to the work of the Public Buildings Administration"; on page 39, line 2, after the word "dissolution", to strike out "\$1,226,540" and insert "\$1,000,000", and in line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$707,090" and insert "\$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 7, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$17,656,500" and insert "\$19,656,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Elimination of grade crossings", on page 48, line 3, after the word "crossings", to strike out "\$22,000,000" and insert "\$16,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 7, to strike out:

PUBLIC-LANDS HIGHWAYS

For the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations other than the forest reservations, under the provisions of the act of June 24, 1930 (23 U. S. C. 3), \$500,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum is a part of the sum authorized for the fiscal year 1943 by section 7 of the act of September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 869).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, at the end of line 3, to reduce the total

appropriation for the Public Roads Administration, from \$88,500,000 to \$82,700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Housing Authority", on page 49, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$4,526,930" and insert "\$4,277,132"; on page 50, line 6, after the word "elsewhere" and the semicolon, to insert "traveling expenses not to exceed \$243,993"; in line 6, before the word "transfer", to strike out "purchase of two passenger-carrying automobiles"; in line 11, after the word "appliances", to strike out the semicolon and "not to exceed \$5,000 for the purchase and exchange of lawbooks and other books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; not to exceed \$2,500 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Administrator, at meetings or conventions concerned with the work of the Authority; not to exceed \$15,000 for the preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; not to exceed \$25,000 for employing persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, for special reporting, engineering, technical, legal, and other services determined necessary by the Administrator, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended"; and in line 24, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "(a) the amount used by the Authority in connection with its informational service functions, including press and related activities, photographic displays, exhibits, and other educational or descriptive pamphlets or materials, printing, binding, and reproduction of materials involving informational service functions, shall not exceed \$90,000, and (b)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 7, after the figures "\$120,000", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no part of the funds made available under this paragraph shall be used for informational service functions."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the committee amendment on page 51, beginning in line 7, and reading as follows:

Provided further, That no part of the funds made available under this paragraph shall be used for informational service functions.

It will be noted from the committee amendment on page 50, beginning with line 24 and ending on line 5 on page 51, to which the Senate has just agreed, that the House had appropriated \$90,000 for the purpose of informational services. In addition to disposing, as it were, of the funds for this informational service, the amendment which is now under discussion further provides that no funds herein appropriated can be used to give any informational service. I am just wondering why it is that the committee saw fit to select the United States Housing Authority for such treatment, and did not put in a like provision similarly affecting the T. V. A., the R. F. C., the

H. O. L. C., the S. E. C., and other like organizations?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will notice that in line 4, page 51, there was no limitation at all put on the \$90,000, and the whole provision was stricken out.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but that \$90,000 was to be used to maintain the informational service now in existence. Now you have dispensed with that service, and I am not quarreling about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no limitation on it. So we will have to put some limitation on it beyond a shadow of a doubt.

Mr. ELLENDER. But you are not putting any limitation on it. You have prevented it altogether by eliminating the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the amendment, if any other department of Government desires information from the United States Housing Authority, that information cannot be furnished by the Housing Authority if it is to be publicized at all. It will simply mean that any department which desires information from the United States Authority will be obliged to send its own forces to get the information.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not see why such a limitation should be imposed, especially in view of the fact that the \$90,000 that was utilized in the past for those informational services has been entirely stricken from the bill. I do hope that the Senate will not agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, beginning in line 7.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say a word or two about the amendment. With respect to the \$90,000 which was stricken out, the United States Housing Authority could have used any amount it pleased, or it could have used all of it for information service. Information service does not mean information. It means publicity. The Congress some time ago provided a limitation on publicity. Up to that time every activity or agency of the Government was setting up a publicity division. They all had publicity divisions. I think without exception one of the first things an agency did was to establish a publicity division. That proceeding became very unpopular, and they changed the name to "informational division." It is precisely the same thing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator unwittingly made a statement which the language in the bill does not altogether support. The Senator said that there was no limitation on the amount of money herein appropriated which might be spent for informational services. As a matter

of fact, if he will read, commencing in line 7, the proviso says:

Provided further, That no part of the funds made available under this paragraph shall be used for informational service functions.

That means that none of it may be used for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is just the point I was making. Suppose some other department of Government should desire to obtain information from the United States Housing Authority, and that the United States Housing Authority should use its own force to obtain the information. As I understand the amendment, that information could not be publicized by the department desiring it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, it could. If the Senator has an amendment which will make it absolutely certain beyond peradventure that the Housing Authority may give information when called upon to do so, that is all right but there should be no publicity.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Maryland has just pointed out, the language is as plain as it could be:

Provided further, That no part of the funds made available under this paragraph shall be used for informational service functions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit, I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As the Senator knows, the 16 housing agencies, of which the U. S. H. A. is one, have been consolidated. They have not been completely transferred, but there is a movement on foot to transfer them. The President has issued an order, and we are hoping that some time the actual transfer will take place.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the transfers have virtually been made.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is not correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, United States Housing activities are under the National Housing Authority at present, and the United States Housing Authority is one of the few agencies which will be retained in order to carry out the functions of the National Housing Authority.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I am attempting to tell the Senator is that the actual transfer has not as yet taken place. The committee of which I happen to be chairman was appointed by the Senate to make inquiry into housing, outside the Executive order. The work of transferring the agencies cannot be done by the stroke of a pen. It requires a great deal of relocation of functions and reallocation of work, floor space, and so forth. I am not saying that in a critical way, but one of the agencies which has temporarily, at least, stopped taking on new work is the United States Housing Authority. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That is, it has stopped taking on new work under the original act, because of lack of funds.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The agency itself is now being used by the National Housing Authority for the purpose of carrying on defense housing throughout the country.

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot quite agree with that statement. Of course, what it has already done must be administered. Payments to the municipalities over a period of 60 years must be made, and collections from the municipalities must come back. The point I am making is that its field for new work is temporarily at a standstill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The United States Housing Authority is now completing 85,000 units which are in process of construction.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition, as I have just pointed out, the agency is being used by the National Housing Authority to build defense housing throughout the country.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I am trying to say to the Senator is that it has been interested in providing defense housing rather than slum clearance housing, which was its original function. It has been utilized, along with the Farm Security Administration and every other housing activity, to provide houses quickly in communities which need them; but its normal functions are now at a standstill. Therefore, the need to go out and sell this idea to the communities of the United States during this emergency does not exist. It would be a waste of money to appropriate such a sum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why was it necessary, then, for the committee to strike from the bill on page 51 the \$90,000 which was set aside for the purpose of establishing the informational service? That is what was done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly. We wanted to save the \$90,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition, it is sought to prevent the agency from using any of the remaining appropriation which we are now making to give out information which may be publicized.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the object.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, if Mr. Mellett desires to obtain information on the United States Housing for publicity purposes, as I understand the amendment, that information cannot be furnished by the office force of the Housing Authority.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; let me explain. When this agency was engaged in its normal activities it became necessary to publicize its plan, and to explain, in pamphlets, over the radio, through motion pictures, and otherwise, how it proposed to work. Temporarily all its original function has been arrested. It has been devoted primarily to defense housing, and not to slum clearance per se, as was envisioned in the beginning. Therefore it is not necessary to tell Baltimore, Detroit, or New Orleans about the old plan for the time being; and it not being necessary, the committee wants to save the \$90,000. That is all that is involved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we not saving it when we delete it from the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is strange. Whenever an appropriation bill came up in the past for the maintenance of this agency, has not the committee set aside a specific sum for informational service?

Mr. TYDINGS. We have done so in the past.

Mr. ELLENDER. The House did so in this case. The House set aside \$90,000 for that purpose. The Senate has been asked to delete it. We have deleted it and thereby reduced the appropriation in the sum of \$90,000. In addition, what you are now suggesting under the amendment which I am challenging, as I read it, is that "not one single dime of the rest of the money herein appropriated shall be used for the purpose of giving information which will be later used by the newspapers, or for other publicity purposes."

Mr. TYDINGS. No. The Senator is not well informed on the subject. The intention, as is clearly shown by the testimony, is that the head of the U. S. H. A. may furnish Mr. Mellett with any statistics which he wants; but this money may not be used by the head of the U. S. H. A. to print his own pamphlets and disseminate them to the public.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose he should desire to give an interview to a newspaper which wanted to obtain some information and—

Mr. TYDINGS. He could give an interview. That would not cost anything.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose it should become necessary for the employees of U. S. H. A. to obtain facts which the newspaper desired. Could any funds be utilized to give such information?

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Let me say to the Senator that this amendment was reported more than a week ago. Has the Senator received any complaint? Every other agency has complained when its appropriation has been reduced. This is one of the very few which has not complained. In the case of other agencies whose appropriations have been reduced 25 cents, their representatives have been around to see why the reduction was made. So far as I know, there has not been any complaint with respect to this item.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; there has been no complaint with respect to the slashing of the \$90,000, and I am not complaining about it now.

Mr. McKELLAR. There has been no complaint about the language used. I do not recall the slightest complaint. I am wondering why there should be any.

Mr. ELLENDER. The language may have been inserted in the bill after the hearings, when there was no opportunity for complaint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, in lines 7 to 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 23, after the numerals "1944", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the amount made available for administrative expenses may be transferred to the National Bureau of Standards to carry out

specific projects of the Authority, upon the request of the Administrator, for studies of the properties and suitability of building materials, with particular reference to their use in low-cost and low-rent housing, including the construction of such experimental structures as may be necessary therefor, and for printing, binding, and disseminating the results of such studies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 11, after "(42 U. S. C. 1410)", to strike out "\$15,000,000" and insert "\$13,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office", on page 54, line 10, after the word "expenses", to insert "not to exceed \$145,845"; in line 12, after the word "books", to strike out "lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals" and insert "and lawbooks", and in line 16, after the words "miscellaneous items", to strike out "\$498,000" and insert "\$481,795, of which amount not to exceed \$100,000 shall be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 22, after the figures "\$112,000", to insert a comma and "of which amount not to exceed \$12,000 shall be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, at the end of line 24, to reduce the total appropriation for the General Accounting Office, from \$16,936,490 to \$16,920,285.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission—Salaries and Expenses", on page 55, line 8, after the word "expenses", to insert "not to exceed \$85,358", and in line 9, after the word "services", to strike out "\$2,908,012" and insert "\$2,898,528."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 21, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed \$133,249 for", and in line 22, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$850,052" and insert "\$835,247."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 13, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed \$122,315", and in line 14, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$510,955" and insert "\$497,365."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 3, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed \$29,457", and in line 4, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$133,780" and insert "\$130,507."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 25, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed \$99,588", and in the same line, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$475,000" and insert "\$463,935."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 15, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed \$22,302 for" and in the same line, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$652,405" and insert "\$649,927."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 25, after the word "expenses", to insert "not to exceed \$189,000", and on page 59, line 8, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$3,586,240" and insert "\$3,565,240."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 20, after the name "Interstate Commerce Commission", to strike out "\$9,116,444" and insert "\$9,040,749."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 4, after the word "expenses," to insert "including not to exceed \$52,650 for traveling expenses," and in line 10, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$238,165" and insert "\$232,315."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, at the end of line 12, to reduce the total appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission from \$9,557,809 to \$9,476,264.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 60, line 20, after the word "reports", to insert "not to exceed \$59,328 for", and on page 61, line 12, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$8,993,328" and insert "\$8,986,736."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 23, after the name "Cleveland, Ohio", to strike out "\$3,000,000," and insert "\$7,071,000, to be immediately available, and", and in line 25, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That the limitation of \$13,300,000 upon the total cost of construction and equipment of said aircraft engine research laboratory is hereby increased to \$13,971,000."

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee give us the factual information upon which the proposed increase in the appropriation was based?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a giant aircraft engine research laboratory is located at Cleveland, and a supplemental Budget estimate for this amount was sent to Congress by the President and by the Director of the Budget. The following explanation is made by the Director of the Budget:

There is presently available to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics toward the construction of the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory, at Cleveland, Ohio, an unexpended balance of approximately \$3,500,000. The amount required to meet obligations to June 30, 1942, is approximately \$7,000,000. This necessitates an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1943 of \$3,500,000.

The supplemental estimate for 1942 also provides for increasing the authorized limitation of cost for the construction and equipment of the above-mentioned research laboratory from \$13,300,000 to \$18,171,000. This increase in limitation of cost is made necessary because of (a) a general increase in construction and equipment costs due to war conditions; (b) the construction of the project on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis rather than a lump-sum basis as originally contemplated; (c) the necessity for acceleration in the completion of the project made necessary by the existence of a state of war; and (d) the fact that previous estimates were of necessity based upon incomplete designs.

The increase in the Budget estimate for 1943 from \$3,000,000 to \$7,071,000 is to provide the funds necessary to complete the construction and equipment of the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory in that fiscal year under the increase in limit of cost mentioned above.

The foregoing supplemental estimates of appropriation are made necessary by contingencies which have arisen since the transmission of the Budget for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943.

This is a war measure, of course. The research laboratory, especially as to aircraft engines, is a matter of prime importance, as it was represented to us. The committee thought so, and reported the amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for the explanation. My inquiry was prompted because of a certain reason. Let me preface the statement of the reason by stating my personal willingness to increase this appropriation to five times the amount proposed for this research laboratory or for any other research laboratory. However, I wish to state to the Senate that within the past 2 weeks four different designs for airplane engines have gone through my office, and I have put the respective persons concerned in contact with the proper agencies of the Government. Within the last hour and a half I took to the appropriate naval authorities some gentlemen who have designed a new type of aircraft engine.

All these research laboratories—and we have many of them—are performing a proper and necessary function. However, if they are merely reaching up into the blue, and are accomplishing nothing, a question properly arises in the mind of every one of us as to whether they are performing the necessary duties and functions for which they were created. In view of the fact that from outside these laboratories scores of proposals are coming to the service agencies for their use, a doubt arose in my mind as to whether the research laboratories were absolutely and properly performing the functions for which they were designed. It was that thought which prompted my inquiry as to whether the proposed increase is based on a factual situation that warrants the increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 61, lines 23 and 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 4, to increase the total appropriation for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics from \$15,018,328 to \$19,082,736.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Archives", on page 62, line 25, after the word "public" and the semicolon, to insert "not to exceed \$4,400 for"; in the same line, after the word "expenses", to strike out the comma and "including not to exceed \$1,000 for the expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the furtherance of the pur-

poses of the said acts"; and on page 63, line 6, after the words "motor vehicle", to strike out "\$1,134,325" and insert "\$1,032,725."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, with reference to the proposed reduction in the appropriation for The National Archives, I wish to make a brief statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from North Carolina spoke to me about that.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say that I am in full sympathy with the work of the committee, and I wish to commend it for its efforts to bring about a reduction of expenditures. I am fully committed to that policy; but in this particular matter it seems to me that we are likely to make a mistake. It is proposed to reduce the appropriation for The National Archives by \$102,000, reducing it to \$1,032,000—about 10 percent or a little less—without giving any reason.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that the subcommittee did not pass on this item, but when it came to the full committee a member of the committee moved that the item be reduced by \$100,000; and a motion to that effect was carried, I think, unanimously.

The National Archives is a splendid institution, and I have no doubt that it is doing good work; but it was thought that \$100,000 could be saved. It was felt that much of the work represented by the item could be postponed for the duration of the war. That is why the reduction was recommended by the committee.

Has the Senator in mind an amendment relating to the item, or what is his suggestion about it?

Mr. BAILEY. I am hoping that the Senate will reject the committee amendment. I can make a suggestion, but I wish to place the facts before the Senate. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his statement; he has stated the case. The amendment came before the full committee, after the subcommittee had failed to suggest any such amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. The subcommittee proposed the amendment at the bottom of page 62, in line 25, and at the top of page 63, in lines 1, 2, and 3; but the proposed reduction in the appropriation for The National Archives was discussed in the full committee, and it was believed that The National Archives could get along very well with \$1,032,725.

Mr. BAILEY. That is the point to which I wish to address my remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will state to the Senator in a moment the amount of the appropriation last year for The National Archives.

Mr. BAILEY. We are told that in the committee it was said, "Here is an appropriation of a little more than a million dollars, and we can cut off more than a hundred thousand dollars."

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the appropriation last year was \$1,065,822. So the Senator can see that the difference between the amount appropriated last year and the amount of the present proposal is about \$30,000.

I suggest to the Senator, if he is particularly interested in the item; that I

am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, as one member of the committee, to have the amount made what it was last year—that is to say, \$1,065,000.

Mr. BAILEY. That would be some help, but I wish to place the facts before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not disputing the Senator from Tennessee. What happened is now very evident to all of us. A motion was made in the full committee, notwithstanding the subcommittee and the House could see no necessity or reason for a reduction of \$102,000. So far as it appears to the Senate, the motion was made on general principles, without having in mind anything in particular except the thought, "Here is a chance to save \$100,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the Senator does the committee an injustice, and he does me an injustice.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not want to do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that I agreed to the amendment, and it was recommended because it was pointed out that last year The National Archives had received an appropriation of \$1,065,000, and it was not believed that that amount should be increased while the Nation was in the war. I simply wish to say to the Senator that I hope he will be willing to compromise, just as the Senator from Kentucky did a little while ago in a very admirable way, and let this item remain at the same figure it was last year. I hope very much the Senator will do that.

Mr. BAILEY. I am quite agreeable to all suggestions, but I am trying to state the reasons for my position, in order to get the facts before the Senate. I am not disputing any matters of fact with anyone. The Senator from Tennessee has aided me very greatly in his statement that the committee thought that, on account of the war, we might reduce the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not reduce the appropriation, but simply appropriate the same amount which was provided last year.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand now that the thought was, "On account of the war they might as well have the same as they had last year." It happens that last year, on account of the war, we increased the appropriation for the National Archives by \$75,000, in round numbers.

The effect of this amendment is to wipe out that increase. So we are saying today that The National Archives is not entitled to this money on account of the war, but last year we said on account of the war it was entitled to it. It may be a singular thing that The Archives need an extra appropriation on account of the war; but the Congress found it to be a fact last year; the Director of the Budget found it to be a fact; the President of the United States found it to be a fact; and it is the fact.

Now, let us see about that. The National Archives is a comparatively new institution. In the first instance, it is a great space-saving institution. It has now 300,000 cubic feet of space for records which are in other departments and which are causing to that extent crowded conditions in those departments. If The

Archives shall be given a chance, it will take these records from the Navy, the War, the State, and other Departments, and put them where they belong, in The Archives Building, and there will be a saving of 300,000 cubic feet of office space. I think that would be a saving to the Government of over \$100,000. That would justify leaving the appropriation provided by the House.

There is another factor about which I wish the Senate to know. The Archives is not a defense activity, but the Federal Government could not operate without its past records. It is a most singular fact to me, and I think it is official—at any rate I can vouch for it—that 20 percent of the Reserves recruited in the Navy during the last 6 months were recruited from records in The Archives.

Furthermore, the maps of the cities of the world which unfortunately our country may be under the necessity of attacking are in The Archives. They have left the State Department. The State Department seems not to have known it, but The National Archives found them and has supplied that source of information.

I have before me a letter from the Navy Department. I shall not read the entire letter, but I shall ask that it be printed in the RECORD in full. It was addressed to The Archivist under date of April 27, and I quote from it as follows:

As you probably are aware, during the quarter, January–March 1942, the Bureau of Navigation alone made 35,000 requests for services on The National Archives. These services for the most part were indispensable calls for records of former service men who have been reenlisting in the Navy since December 7, 1941.

Since last October approximately 17,000 square feet of Navy Department space, most of it A-1 office areas, have been cleared for vital activities by the transfer of Navy records to The National Archives. The rapidly expanding naval program makes it essential that this outlet, transfers of records to The National Archives, continue to be available and to a greater extent than in the last 6 months.

I now ask that the letter in full be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
April 27, 1942.

THE ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES,
The National Archives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Recently it has become apparent that facilities provided by The National Archives will be curtailed if the proposed reduction of funds therefor during the next fiscal year is effected. Meanwhile this office has formulated plans for a continued and increased use by the Navy Department of National Archives' facilities during the coming year.

As you probably are aware, during the quarter, January–March 1942, the Bureau of Navigation alone made 35,000 requests for services on The National Archives. These services for the most part were indispensable calls for records of former service men who have been reenlisting in the Navy since December 7, 1941.

Since last October approximately 17,000 square feet of Navy Department space, most of it A-1 office areas, have been cleared for vital activities by the transfer of Navy records to The National Archives. The rapidly expanding naval program makes it essen-

tial that this outlet, transfers of records to The National Archives, continue to be available and to a greater extent than in the last 6 months.

Assumption of the storage, maintenance, and service on these records by National Archives' personnel is a substantial relief to the hard-pressed personnel in the Naval Establishment. That part of the Navy Department personnel which was assigned to The National Archives after December 7, 1941, to assist in essential and large-scale arrangement and service on Navy records should be relieved by National Archives' personnel not later than July 1, 1942.

Little headway has been made in relieving the records congestion in navy yards and other shore establishments, including records of ships deposited therein. It is earnestly desired that The National Archives will be enabled to provide several field representatives to assist in the prompt elimination of valueless records as provided by law and the provision of secure storage and ready availability of valuable records at these points.

These matters are brought to your attention to emphasize the fact that those divisions and facilities in The National Archives which the Navy Department uses daily are in effect extensions of the Department itself. This office has a very real concern in the continuance and, in certain important aspects such as assistance in the field, the extension of those facilities.

Very truly yours,

EMMETT J. LEAHY,
Director of Records Coordination.

Mr. BAILEY. So I am saying it is a matter of economy to leave this appropriation as provided by the House bill. If we reduce it, The Archives will not be able to make available 300,000 cubic feet of space for the Navy and War Departments. Every Senator knows the value of that space, and how pressing the need for it is.

Furthermore, The Archives will not be able to meet the inquiries made upon it. The demands for information upon The Archives since the war began in December have increased from 40,000 a month to 90,000 a month. Those departments are not asking idle questions. They are going to The Archives for information because that is where the information is kept; but if there is not a sufficient force provided to answer the questions, there might as well be no Archives.

The whole argument seems to me one of necessity and economy. I think we will save money rather than lose it by letting this appropriation remain as provided by the other House and not reducing it. If the officials of The Archives had had an opportunity to come before the subcommittee, they would have explained this item. They went before the House committee, but they had no opportunity before the Senate committee. I am not complaining about that, and they are not complaining, but, if they have a sound economic cause, if they will really save money for the Government, then, it is not economy merely to knock out \$100,000 because \$100,000 is here.

I have other letters. Here is one from the Tennessee Valley Authority expressing appreciation and interest.

Here is another from the Federal Trade Commission from which I will quote:

In compliance with the directions given by the President, the Federal Trade Commission has had to solve the problem of making available in its building more than 50,000 square feet of space for the accommodation

of agencies directly concerned with the war effort.

Partial solution of the problem rested on the emergency removal from this building of nearly 6,500 cubic feet of records.

The records were transferred to The Archives.

If we are going to stop that process, we will leave these records jammed up in the various departments, crowd more departments out of Washington, and crowd more departments wherever they may be. We have a place in The Archives, but we propose to lose that space or not to make it available.

Here is a letter from the Office of Price Administration under date of November 15 expressing appreciation for material and information furnished in connection with wood and similar products. There was missing a pamphlet which they considered of the utmost importance. They had failed to obtain it elsewhere, but they got it from The Archives.

Here is the testimony from the Department of Justice.

Here is a letter from the National Mediation Board; and here is another from the Federal Trade Commission, to which I referred a moment ago.

I have a letter here from the Interoffice Communication, signed by Mr. Almon R. Wright, Acting Chief of the Division of State Department Archives. He says:

In the past week members of the staff of the Division of State Department Archives have succeeded in uncovering a group of consular inspection reports to which are attached a number of maps of cities throughout the world in which consular posts have existed. Since representatives of the Board of Economic Warfare have made frequent requests and have displayed much interest in materials of this type, we communicated our "find" to them. Yesterday, the 24th, representatives of the intelligence unit of the Army Air Corps and of the Board of Economic Warfare came to view the maps in question. Great interest was displayed, and I was informed by Mr. Elias J. Drexler, extension 2940, Commerce Department, that this group of records and maps was one which the intelligence people of the Army, of the Board of Economic Warfare, and of the air force had been seeking for 4 months. Apparently, the Department of State had been unable to afford these agencies any information about this collection.

To cite an illustration of the use of these maps, the following may be of interest:

Dr. W. B. Poland, of the Board of Economic Warfare, said to have been adviser on railroads to the Chinese Government, told us of his recollection of a vital point in the main railroad line from Manchuria to a Korean port. He was unable to tell just where this point was, but wished to see any maps which might be of some value in his inquiry. A large map of the region of Korea and Manchuria was produced. From this he gathered that the vital point was located at a certain city.

And so on.

So, Mr. President, with regard to the whole economic effort, and our war effort, we are necessarily related to our past experience. We have the experience accumulated in The Archives but men are needed there to make it available to us and to the Government departments.

We created The National Archives for the purpose of clearing out the space which had been occupied by the great

accumulation of records during nearly 160 years of our existence, and if we can get those records out of the various departments and put them where they belong, in The Archives, we will save 300,000 square feet of space.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. One word, and then I shall yield.

How large a space is 300,000 cubic feet? Yesterday I was tendering to Mr. Reynolds, who is in charge of the matter of moving governmental activities from Washington, a building in the city of Asheville, a magnificent city hall building 10 stories high. I have been in that building, but I will not undertake to describe it beyond saying it is a magnificent building. I would have said it contained 300,000 square feet of space, but I was informed that it contained only 80,000 square feet. Three hundred thousand cubic feet, of course, is nearly four times that large. By putting these records in the keeping of The Archives, we can save for the activities of the Government in Washington the space of nearly 4 buildings as large as the magnificent city building at Asheville, which the Government is thinking of taking over because it cannot carry on all its activities here.

Mr. President, I have made my argument, and I hope that the Senate will let this \$102,000 remain in the bill as the President recommended, as the Congress itself approved, as the House approved, and as the subcommittee approved. All the evidence is that it was stricken out without a hearing, and mainly because all of us are bent upon saving money. But if we are to save money in that way, I can take every appropriation and say, "Well, it is a million dollars, let us cut off \$100,000." That is not economy, and that is not the way to go about getting economy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have the figures in the committee room, but I do not have them here. I was wondering whether the Senator had figures as to the number of employees already in The National Archives.

Mr. BAILEY. No, I have not; but I do not think there is an excessive number. I have never heard anything to that effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not the figures, but I was just making a calculation, that if we took this appropriation as reported by the Senate committee, and allowed every employee \$2,000 a year, it would provide for over a thousand employees.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Senator is under a misapprehension.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I do not think I am.

Mr. BAILEY. It is not a matter of employees. If the Senator will go to that building, as I take it he has done, he will find it is a magnificently equipped structure. There is a tremendous amount of activity and machinery there for the preservation of records. It is not altogether a matter of employees, clerks, and assistants.

I am not prepared to say what proportion of the appropriation is for clerks, but I do say this money is needed in order to have people there who will take the documents out of the departments and make room, and who will be prepared to furnish the departments proper information when called upon.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not desire to infer that all this money is spent for employees; but a considerable amount of it is. A few days ago the Archivist was in my office. He came there for the purpose of saving records which the committee investigating overlapping and duplicating agencies of the Government had obtained and which we are now going over very carefully in order to ascertain whether we can make some constructive suggestions. He wanted to save all those records, and he pointed out that he had the records of the Taft committee, which made the last governmental survey.

As I understand, most of the appropriation will go to employees, and when the files are moved from a department to The Archives Building, they are moved by the Navy Department, or by the War Department, or by some other department, and all The Archives employees have to do is to show them where to locate the material.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to correct the distinguished Senator. That is not what the officials and employees of the Archives do. It is not a matter of bringing a bundle of records from somewhere and saying "stick them in this pigeon-hole." That is not the work of The Archives. Every record has to be carefully examined with a view to its value, whether permanent or temporary. If it is of permanent value, it must be so treated that it can be preserved. It is a proceeding requiring great care and study of the documents, paper by paper. That is of the utmost importance, and it must be done by specialists. Let us not get the idea that The Archives is merely a dumping place.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator did not allow me to finish; he interrupted me. Everyone knows, of course, that the purpose of The Archives is to preserve the records of the Government; but let me point out to the Senator that the very records on which he bolstered his case, namely, the records of the sailors and soldiers of the last war, are not, per se, permanent records. When one of those records wears out, a new card is made, and it does not follow that the cards are treated with a certain kind of shellac. The files moved from the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Veterans' Bureau are taken to The Archives Building and stacked up there in place of in the department where they had been located. That is all there is to it. They are all alphabetized, are all broken down into certain groups, and the key goes with The Archives.

The Senator pointed out that in one case—just think of it—6,500 cubic feet of records had been taken from one department and brought to The Archives Building. I am no mathematician, but I took the cube root of 6,500 cubic feet, and it is a space about 18 feet long, 18 feet wide, and 18 feet high. If we are to

bolster the case by citing such a small space as that in The Archives Building, we had better stop.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me finish, and then I shall yield. I waited for the Senator to finish.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Senator would like to appear to be fair. I should say he would like to be fair, but when he states that I bolstered my case on the basis of 6,500 cubic feet, he was certainly unmindful of the fact that I predicated the case upon 300,000 cubic feet, and simply used the 6,500 as a small piece of further evidence in a letter from the Navy Department. He would not misrepresent the facts, I know, but if I did not correct his statement, it would stand from the testimony of the distinguished Senator from Maryland that this case rested upon a little matter of 6,500 cubic feet, and he, himself, will state that it does not.

Mr. TYDINGS. Even if we take the 300,000 cubic feet, we would not have a very large area of floor space; and we erected the building in order to have a place where we could store records. I do not think that is any argument at all for an increase. It was assumed when we built the building we would take the records there and place them in the building, and that the personnel we would employ to do that would look after the records, and put them in the right place after they got there.

The keeping of The Archives essentially divides itself into two categories—keeping those records which will be used, those which are current, and keeping those which are antiquated. When records are antiquated, they are taken away, and sealed, and put in a place by themselves. The files to which the Senator refers as coming from the Navy are not antiquated. In my judgment, it would have been almost wise to send the Navy files back, for if they had 35,000 inquiries, they could have dispensed with any number of clerks in The Archives Building, if the files had been retained in the Navy Department. It seems to me that not much of a case has been made out for \$100,000.

To conclude, I would not labor the point. The National Archives is a fine institution, but it is not possible to find a department of the Government as to which an intelligent man cannot make out a splendid case for not cutting a single penny from its appropriation.

Mark you, we are only 5 months in the war, that is all. It may well last 5 years. Like every one else, I hope it will be over tomorrow, or next week at the latest; but we may have a long war on our hands, and only a month ago we passed a war powers bill, properly giving the administration the right to go into the Federal Reserve banks and put its note down and take back five, ten, fifteen, twenty, fifty, or a hundred billion dollars of printed money, not bonds we will sell to the public, not bonds which the banks will buy, not bonds which the insurance companies will buy. The Government may not have time to wait, it must have the money to keep functioning. So we inserted a provision permitting the Treasury of the United States to borrow from the Federal

Reserve banks on its I O U any amount of money, without limit, it might require.

I voted to put some ceiling on the amount when the Senator from Ohio offered an amendment to that effect; but the men who asked for that power were looking ahead to the day when it might be pretty hard to find purchasers of Government securities who would furnish an amount sufficient, with money raised by taxation, to pay the cost of the war and of the Government.

A new tax bill will soon be coming along. Think of it, a man who makes \$800 a year will have to go down in his pocket and give the Government \$8. A married man with an income of \$1,600 likewise will have to pay to the Federal Government a direct tax, in addition to all his other taxes; and this is only the start.

Next year we shall have another tax bill, mark my word, which will be even more drastic than the forthcoming one.

Mr. President, I should like to accede to The Archivist's request. He is interested in his little activity, as we are all interested in our activities, but I am here to say that unless Congress begins to save money right now we shall rue it before this international situation is over. We cannot continue running the Government as we did in times of peace and at the same time not only finance our own war effort but the war effort in part of Russia, Great Britain, China, Australia, the Dutch East Indies, the free Belgians, and the free French, the Czechoslovaks, and all the others we are financing in whole or in part. If we are to embrace that sort of a world war effort we must look around and find places where reductions can be made. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will not accept any increase in the appropriation for The Archives, because I think \$1,000,000 a year now for The Archives is a great deal of money in the midst of a war in which our interests are at stake in every particular.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and myself I submit an amendment to House bill 6430, the pending bill, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be printed and lie on the table.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 74, line 9, after the word "statutes", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That the sum of \$20,000,000 from the said construction fund shall be available for the construction of towboats and barges adapted for use in the transportation of oil, gasoline, and other fuels over the inland or coastal waters of the United States."

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senate's attention to the manner in which appropriations for The Archives have been increased. In 1936 the amount appropriated for that institution was \$475,000; in 1937 it was \$615,000; in 1938, \$717,000; in 1939, \$789,000; in 1940, \$864,000; in 1941, \$932,860; and in 1942, \$993,340.

The present bill appropriates over \$1,000,000 for The Archives. Surely they should not complain at the treatment they have received. In a period of 7 years the appropriation for The Archives has been increased more than 100 percent. Under those circumstances, it seems to me the committee amendment ought to be agreed to, and I hope it will be.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I wish to conclude simply with a correction of two statements. With respect to a statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I will say that I have a note which I am satisfied is from Mr. Page, the administrative secretary of The National Archives, which says:

We pay all expenses for moving records to The National Archives.

I think we can take that as a matter of fact.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the Senator some questions about that statement? What does that statement, "We pay" mean? Do employees of The Archives go to the Navy Department and gather up the records there?

Mr. BAILEY. They pay all the expenses of moving. The Senator is a good lawyer. I know he knows it does not mean that they gather up the records, but they move them.

Mr. TYDINGS. Where are the records located when they are moved? Are they placed on the ground floor so The Archives can send a truck and get them? To move the records referred to would not involve more than a couple of thousand dollars a year.

Mr. BAILEY. If I were to try to interpret it I would say that "moving to" means getting the records to the back door. If I move to Washington and get to Washington, that is all that can be said about it. That does not include going to a hotel.

Now, with respect to another matter of fact. My distinguished friend the Senator from Tennessee called attention quite solemnly to the increases in the appropriations for The Archives that have been brought about in the last 6 or 7 years. The Archives have not appropriated any money to themselves. All these increases came by way of acts of Congress, and came from the Committee on Appropriations, and with the approval of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I take it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Not only that, but I introduced the bill and did everything in my power to secure the passage of the bill establishing The National Archives, and finally it was passed by the Senate and by the House. How could anyone be more friendly toward the institution than I am? I did my best to create it, and with the help of my fellow Senators and Representatives it was created. I am thoroughly responsible for it. It is a great institution. We ought to uphold it wherever it is possible, but that does not mean to give it carte blanche to come before the committees and be given whatever they request in the way of appropriations. I think they could well go a little slow in these days when the Government is in such straits for money.

Mr. President, I wish to say here and now in this public place that the Secretary of the Treasury is doing a wonderful job; I think he is doing as efficient a job as anyone in connection with the Government of the United States. He has sold something like \$5,000,000,000 of Defense Bonds in the last 11 months. I honor him and respect him for doing that; but this is no reason why he should use money in his Department extravagantly, and if he came here and asked for an extravagant appropriation—an appropriation that is not necessary—I would be against it. I feel it my duty to take such a position. Heaven knows, I do not want to make myself unpopular with people in the various bureaus and departments. Why should I do that? What does it mean to me more than to anyone else to take such a stand? My only reason for taking the stand I am taking today is a patriotic desire to help my country. I do not want to have men in Washington criticizing me whenever they see me simply because I am not willing to give whatever they desire for their particular departments, for their particular activities. It is no personal pleasure for me to have differences with officials in the various departments. But we have got to win the war. That ought to come before everything else. That ought to be our first idea. We ought to make everything subservient to that one principal effort at this time—to win the war. To that end we must use all our sinews of war, all our money, so far as possible. As the President said the other night, we should save all money possible to put into War bonds. At the same time we should not permit lavish and extravagant expenditures by various departments and activities of Government.

I wish to say in conclusion that the item in question is a very small one, and if we were not at war I would not have a word to say against an increase of this sort. I did not do so until after the war began. However, with the war before us, with the necessity for money that is confronting us, there is but one position for me to take as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and that is to seek to cut down all nondefense appropriations so far as it can be reasonably and fairly and justly done. That was the sentiment which animated every member of the Committee on Appropriations. Its members did not have any other view. They did not want to get into trouble with the various officials of the departments, we do not want anything of that sort, but we have a duty to perform. It is our duty to cut down useless and extravagant appropriations. The departments and other governmental activities ought to join us in that effort. In the last few days I have been appealing to members of the various departments to join us in trying to save, and I want to say that for the most part they feel that way. They are doing the best they can to bring about economies, and I think we ought to do our duty in that respect.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, when I yielded to my distinguished friend, little did I suspect that my feeble remarks

would be capable of provoking such flights of oratory, such protests to heaven. I wonder now what I could have said, I wonder what secret chord I touched that aroused the muse, that called us forth to battle, to the blowing of bugles, the prayer to God—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield gladly, but I hope I do not move the Senator to oratory again.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say that the Senator's marvelous personality, his great genius for argument, and for discussion on the floor, made me doubt whether I ought to oppose him at all. Indeed, I tried to compromise with him to keep from opposing him, but the Senator would not accept a compromise. He has argued his point, and has argued it strongly, and it was for that reason that I replied. I hope the Senator will forgive me.

Mr. BAILEY. I am very grateful to the Senator, and I forgive him, but I still cannot explain what it was I said that provoked these flights of rhetoric.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought we might as well speak plainly.

Mr. BAILEY. The matter is a serious one. I appreciate the Senator's offer of a compromise. I would rather take a vote on the merits of this question by a show of hands. I think the case has been fully stated on both sides. We have the matter fully before us.

If Senators think we should dispense with the appropriation which we made because of the war, it is all right with me. I simply read the record, obtained the facts, and was persuaded that this effort at economy was uneconomic. I leave it to the Senate, and ask for a show of hands, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 62, beginning in line 25, and on page 63, in line 6. On this question a division has been demanded.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 63, at the end of line 9, to reduce the total appropriation for The National Archives from \$1,146,725 to \$1,045,125.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Park and Planning Commission", on page 64, line 4, after the word "use", to strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$200,000"; in line 5, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$200,000 of said sum" and insert "and"; and in line 7, after the word "Act", to strike out "and \$700,000 to be available for carrying out the provisions of section 4 of said act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission", on page 64, line 18, after the word "newspapers" and the semicolon, to insert "not to exceed \$270,000 for"; and on page 65, line 3, after the word "ex-

penses", to strike out "\$5,380,000" and insert "\$4,850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, at the end of line 7, to reduce the total appropriation for the Securities and Exchange Commission from \$5,440,000 to \$4,910,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission", on page 70, line 1, after the word "elsewhere", to insert "not to exceed \$16,200 for traveling expenses", and in line 9, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$810,000" and insert "\$808,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, at the end of line 25, to reduce the total appropriation for the Tariff Commission, from \$825,000 to \$823,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority", on page 71, line 14, after the words "steam plant" and the semicolon, to insert "the construction of a system of public-use navigation terminals on the Tennessee River"; in line 22, after the word "reference", to strike out "newspapers"; in line 23, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "purchase"; in line 25, after the word "elsewhere", to insert "traveling expenses not to exceed \$615,236"; on page 72, line 4, after the word "field", to strike out "\$136,100,000" and insert "\$172,220,112"; and in line 5, after the word "That", to strike out "this appropriation and any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund 1942," and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1943 (subject to the provisions of sec. 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended), shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1943, to remain available until June 30, 1943, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942: *Provided further, That.*"

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is understood that the Tennessee Valley Authority amendments will not be taken up this afternoon. I suggest that the other amendments be disposed of and that the Tennessee Valley Authority amendments go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Tennessee Valley Authority amendments will go over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Maritime Commission—State Marine School Act of March 4, 1911", on page 74, line 20, after the figures "\$50,000", to insert "the State of Maine, \$60,416.66, of which amount \$10,416.66 shall be available immediately," and on page 75, line 6, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$360,416.66."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, at the end of line 8, to increase the total

appropriation for the United States Maritime Commission from \$980,380,000 to \$980,440,416.66.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration", on page 81, line 20, after the name "United States", to insert "This section shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of those passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 23, before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided, That all necessary expenses not exceeding \$150,000 in the aggregate (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1943, by the Authority shall be considered as non-administrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That necessary expenses in collecting monthly installments on contracts and repossessing appliances in case of default, not to exceed \$2.50 per year per contract, shall not be considered as administrative expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a few days ago, I discussed with the Senator in charge of the bill a circumstance which I think can be corrected by the amendment which I shall offer, which I think will meet with the approval of all Senators.

In this bill travel pay is defined in most cases as "not exceeding \$16,000," "not exceeding \$4,000," or "not exceeding" some other sum. However, there are half a dozen cases in the bill in which travel pay is allowed and no provision for the amount of it is fixed. Theoretically, the whole appropriation could be used for travel pay. I have prepared an amendment to bring the whole bill into line. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 5. Where in this act appropriations have been authorized to be expended for traveling expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for travel expenses may not exceed the amount set forth therefor in the Budget estimates submitted for the appropriations.

Mr. TYDINGS. What the Budget Bureau approved for travel pay in the break-down of the appropriation would be the maximum which any agency could receive, when there is no limitation. I

think the Senator from Tennessee has stated that he is agreeable to the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. I think it is in line with what we have already done, and I hope it will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask unanimous consent to offer. The reason why I ask unanimous consent is that I have doubt as to whether it is in order. The amendment is, on page 4, line 3, before the period, to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the salary of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be at the rate of \$12,000 per annum effective on the date of the enactment of this act."

The reason for offering this amendment is that Mr. Smith, the present director, now receives \$10,000. Those in comparative positions receive \$12,000, and this request has been made in order to conform to the general principle which has been established. The request comes from the White House, and I think it is perfectly proper and just. I hope there will be no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Tennessee for a moment. In considering the legislative appropriation bill which is now on the calendar, I find that appropriation has been made for practically all standard periodicals, such as trade magazines, as well as for newspapers. The daily newspapers of the country and most of the leading weekly newspapers, are bought by the Congressional Library.

In times of peace it has been the practice to make an appropriation available for every agency of the National Government for periodicals and newspapers. All those periodicals, with very few exceptions, are in the Library of Congress, bought by the Congress for the very purpose of being available to those agencies.

Tomorrow at an appropriate time I hope to offer an amendment to strike from these appropriations the authority to buy magazines, periodicals, and newspapers. All an agency has to do is to obtain the magazine, periodical, or newspaper from the Congressional Library. The present practice is for every agency to buy magazines and newspapers; and, while it is only a small thing, it is a waste. It is not good business administration. We ought to save \$30,000 or \$40,000, which we can save, in my judgment, by

adopting the amendment which I shall offer.

I shall therefore move that the words "for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals" wherever they appear in this bill be eliminated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had not thought anything about that suggestion. Of course, the same rule might be applied to the Senate and the House. We could all go over to the Library of Congress and read the newspapers which come to our reading room, the Marble Room; but it would be a waste of considerable time if all of us had to go over to the Library of Congress to read magazines and newspapers. There might be a considerable waste of time if the agencies downtown had to hotfoot it over to the Library of Congress. I do not know to what extent they read newspapers, but I presume some of them try to keep informed about what is going on in the world. It may be part of their duty to read certain periodicals and to keep themselves informed.

At first blush it strikes me that probably more time would be wasted than could be compensated for by the money which would be saved if we should require everybody in the various agencies of the Government who has occasion to read a newspaper or a magazine to go to the Library of Congress. If they all availed themselves of that privilege, the Library would require increased appropriations for that purpose, unless the prospective readers stood in line waiting to find a newspaper or periodical available. There may be something in the Senator's suggestion; but at first blush it strikes me as likely to cause more trouble than would be compensated for by the money which might be saved.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the amendment is adopted, it will be in conference.

I see no reason in the world why the Congress should furnish the department heads with daily newspapers. There may be an occasional case in which some legal notice must be printed, in which event the agency might want a copy; but everybody knows that when legal notices are inserted in newspapers it is part of the trade practice to give the one inserting the notice a free copy of the newspaper, or perhaps half a dozen copies. Neither can I see why the Government should buy periodicals for heads of departments. I think it is a vicious practice.

It may be a small thing, but that is not the point. The point is that small things become important. In any well-regulated government every kind of waste ought to be eliminated, for little bits of waste here and there make up total expenditures which often are so heavy for the people to bear.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I do not know to what extent the Government buys newspapers for its departments. I do not suppose that is done. If an agency has a research department or a reading room for the assembly of employees, or for research purposes, I imagine that

only in such instances are periodicals and magazines purchased for the benefit of the department. Certainly the Government is not buying newspapers for a Cabinet officer to read, or a magazine for a Cabinet officer to read, or for the Administrator of the Social Security Board or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to read; but it might be a hardship if those whose duty requires them to keep informed, especially on technical matters, were required to go to the Library of Congress every time they wanted to read a magazine.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the amendment I shall not propose to strike out the words "books of reference," but I shall propose that there be stricken from the appropriations the words "periodicals and newspapers." Why the Bureau of the Budget wants periodicals and newspapers I do not know.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not, either; but perhaps they could shed some light on the matter if they were asked about it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why the National Resources Planning Board wants newspapers and periodicals I do not know. The Office of Government Reports needs them, and we have given them plenty of money with which to buy them.

It is their duty to provide the agencies of the Government with pertinent news matters, and I know that from time to time they sent Senators and Representatives clippings in which their names appear; but it seems to me I could get all such clippings myself without empowering the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars that I would prefer to have spent for relief, or for rural rehabilitation, or for slum clearance, or for something that would add to the sum total of human happiness. I would rather have the money spent for such purposes than to be provided with a room-full of newspaper clippings.

What does the American Battle Monuments Commission need periodicals and newspapers for? It also says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel says it has to have them. The Board of Tax Appeals says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Civil Service Commission says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Federal Communications Commission says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Electoral Loan Agency says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Electric Home and Farm Authority says it has to have periodicals and newspapers, and so forth. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board says it has to have newspapers and periodicals, but in that connection they cannot spend more than \$500 a year for newspapers and periodicals. The Federal Housing Administration cannot spend over \$1,500 a year for magazines and newspapers.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is all right to limit it, but I understand that the Senator's amendment would bar them from having anything at all for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. It seems to me that the Federal Housing Administration could buy a greater number of magazines and newspapers for \$1,500; it could almost

keep one magazine going completely with that amount of money.

Not only that but the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation says it cannot function without having \$250 for periodicals and newspapers. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation says it has to have periodicals and newspapers. The Federal Power Commission says it cannot operate without newspapers and periodicals; the Federal Works Agency says it has to have newspapers and periodicals; the Federal Trade Commission says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Public Roads Administration has to have a lot of things; I am satisfied that they need maps, and so on, but they seem to need an enormous amount of periodicals and newspapers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator—

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me finish reading the list, and then I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that money for such purchases of newspapers and periodicals is contained in the appropriation for every one of the departments and agencies, let me point out that the bill has been pending since the 23d of January.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the members of the committee seek to inquire from the various agencies as to justification for such expenses? It might be that if they were called on to explain the matter they could justify it; but, as I understand, they were not called upon, and now we have no explanation as to why the expenditures are advisable or why they are proposed to be made.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator makes a strong point there, and I cannot take issue with him, for the reason that I did not discover how widespread is the purchase of newspapers and periodicals in the Government until I happened to scrutinize the reports which our committee has been receiving, and learned of the enormous amount of money, thousands and thousands of dollars, into which all these items pyramid.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not criticizing the Senator's attitude.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. But I think we have to assume that the men who are responsible for the conduct of the various departments of the Government are as reasonable as we are. We hope we are, at least, and we try to be. There may be a justification. I certainly would be sympathetic to any reasonable justification that they can make, because I should not want to bring about even a small saving in money that would handicap a department in keeping in touch with developments, which must be done by means of periodicals and publications of various kinds, and even books. I do not imagine that the head of any department requires the department to buy his personal newspapers which he can read at home at breakfast, or when he goes to lunch, or after he goes to bed at night—as I frequently do; I do not have much time to read other newspapers than the Washington and New York and

Kentucky newspapers, much as I would desire to read them all. Time forbids. However, it is not a bad service every now and then for someone to send me a bunch of clippings showing what a number of people in the Middle West or on the Pacific coast think about what we are doing here. I think it is a matter about which we should be careful, so as not to handicap or hobble Government agencies too much.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator that the one reason I think it important to make the point against such purchases of newspapers and periodicals is that originally only newspapers were purchased, then the Congress inserted in the appropriations the word "periodicals." Now the words "photographs and photographic equipment" have been inserted; and provision for all kinds of sound-recording equipment has been inserted. In one department—I will not name it for the time being—there are machines that cost \$3,000 apiece. Nine of them are idle at this very moment—nine machines worth \$27,000 are idle at a time when another department of the Government needs such machines badly. The machines were bought with funds from the rather loosely worded appropriations which we have gotten into the habit of passing without any examination into them. I believe we can save many millions of dollars out of things such as those I have mentioned. Indeed, a million dollars that we can save today will be a load off the backs of the people and will be a load off the burden the returning soldiers and sailors will have to bear when they come home from this war.

I think we ought to strive to eliminate every bit of waste we can, on the same principle that when a man saves a few tin cans and turns them in to the administrator who is in charge of tin, that is only a very small contribution, but it is his contribution and the other man's contribution that will give us enough tin to carry on through the war. I think that the Senate would do very well to imitate those savings.

So I should like to see such an amendment agreed to, and taken to conference so that we could find out whether there is extravagance along this line. If the agencies need magazines and newspapers, I, as one of the conferees, would withdraw objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not understand that the Senator wanted action on the amendment this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I only wanted to explain it and have it pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I wanted to add to the category of newspapers I read, Maryland newspapers as well as New York and Kentucky newspapers.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say that sometime ago we passed a law—I cannot find it right now—that forbids the head of a governmental department or agency to buy newspapers or periodicals with any funds appropriated by Congress. There must have been an abuse some time in the past, so that it became necessary to enact such legislation.

Subsequent to the passage of that law, gradually over a period of years we have

let every one of the agencies return to that practice, and we have specifically authorized them to buy newspapers and periodicals. So, while we have a law on the statute books saying that none of them shall buy newspapers and periodicals, we have, one at a time, given every agency of the Government the right to buy them. That is how we stopped something and then drifted right back again, fully, into the old fault. The amount involved may be small, but I am convinced that if we are going to have economy it will be accomplished by the saving of little sums which will make big sums, rather than big sums themselves.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not offer the amendment at this time?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; not now.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have received from Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, a memorandum dated April 27, 1942, reading as follows:

Executive Order No. 9112, of March 26, 1942, authorized the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission to make or guarantee loans to finance contractors engaged in business or operations for the prosecution of the war, and thus facilitate the participation of small business enterprises in the war-production effort.

Both the Navy Department and the War Department procured amendments to H. R. 6868 (Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942), making appropriations to the said departments available to carry out the provisions of the said Executive Order No. 9112 (see first paragraph of title I—War Department, and sec. 202 of the enrolled enactment, H. R. 6868).

It appears desirable, therefore, that the Maritime Commission likewise have express authority to expend its funds for the purpose of carrying out the said Executive order. It is suggested that this objective can be secured by an amendment to the bill H. R. 6430 (Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942) by an amendment, as follows:

Page 74, line 13, before the word "Provided", insert the following: "Provided further, That the said construction fund shall be available for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112, of March 26, 1942."

E. S. LAND, Chairman.

I think that is a perfectly proper amendment and that it should be agreed to. I submit it and ask that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 74, in line 13, after "247", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That the said construction fund shall be available for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112 of March 26, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there is one matter to which I should like to recur. The amendment on line 9, page 70, was agreed to. The House appropriated for the Tariff Commission \$810,000, which was reduced by the Senate Committee on Appropriations by \$1,800 only. The amendment is entirely agreeable, and there is no question raised about it.

On the floor of the House, the House reduced by a full 10 percent the appro-

priation recommended by the Budget Bureau for the Tariff Commission. The Budget Bureau recommended \$900,000, and the House committee accepted the recommendation. That figure was less than the appropriation last year. The appropriation has been gradually going down for the last 5 or 6 years. On the floor of the House the appropriation was reduced by 10 percent. I have conferred with the Senator in charge of the bill, and have suggested, and now urge, that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered, and that the reduction may be only 5 percent from the Budget Bureau's recommendation rather than 10 percent.

Mr. TYDINGS. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the motion I made to strike out the words "newspapers and periodicals" wherever they appear now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion goes over until tomorrow.

Mr. TYDINGS. What would be the effect of our considering the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would have no effect on the Senator's motion.

Mr. GEORGE. While, of course, the work of the Tariff Commission has been circumscribed by the war and by international conditions, the Commission is now called on to do some very highly confidential work for the War Production Board, for the Army and Navy Munitions Board, and for the office of the Price Administrator, as well as for the Board of Economic Warfare. The latter organization, which is most important, is not setting up a commodities staff, but is using entirely the Tariff Commission's staff.

I am making this request especially so that the matter may go to conference, not for a restoration of the full amount but for a restoration of half the amount cut out by the House. Unless consent shall be granted and my suggestion prevail, there will be nothing in the conference in regard to this item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. What is the motion of the Senator?

Mr. GEORGE. I am asking unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment on page 70, line 9, was agreed to be reconsidered, and that the amount of \$808,200 be increased by \$45,000. That would put in conference the question of cutting the amount asked for only 5 percent, instead of 10 percent. The House made a cut of 10 percent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not had time to go into the matter, but if the Senator is willing to permit us to take it to conference and see what we can do, without our making any promises, we can take that course.

Mr. GEORGE. I should appreciate the Senator taking it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that the vote by which the amendment on page 70, line 9, was agreed to be reconsidered? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I now offer an amendment to the amendment, that the amount of \$808,200 be increased by \$45,000, to \$853,200.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. It will be necessary to correct the total in line 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk is authorized to correct the total.

FRANK SHEPPARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3767) for the relief of Frank Sheppard, which was read the first time by title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Sheppard, of Lewisburg, W. Va., the sum of \$300, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said Frank Sheppard, on account of personal injuries suffered by him on August 24, 1939, when, while sitting on the front porch of his home at the town of Lewisburg, W. Va., he was struck by a heavy stone thrown by a blast set off by employees of the Work Projects Administration.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on February 26 this year the Senate passed Senate bill 2220, for the relief of Frank Sheppard, appropriating the sum of \$300 for injuries received when he was struck by stones from a blast caused by employees of the Work Projects Administration. The bill went to the House and was there tabled, and an identical House bill was passed. Senate bill 2220 had been approved by the Committee on Claims in the Senate, and passed the Senate. The House bill now before the Senate is identical with the Senate bill which was passed. Mr. President, I do not like the practice of the House shelving a Senate bill, which passed first, but this is a bill which merely compensates Frank Sheppard for the damage and injury caused by the accident, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3767) for the relief of Frank Sheppard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted the following favorable reports of nominations:

Carlton J. H. Hayes, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain.

Cornelius Van H. Engert, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Beirut, Lebanon, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan.

Maynard B. Barnes, of Iowa, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general; and

Laurence W. Taylor, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS—NOMINATION ADVERSELY REPORTED

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bernice B. Lyons to be postmaster at Vinton, La., which had been adversely reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McKELLAR. At the request of one of the Senators from Louisiana, I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS—NOMINATIONS FAVORABLY REPORTED

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Ghormley to be vice admiral.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 1, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30, 1942:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Capt. William Holmes Crosby, Jr., Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Alex Brown, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Charles Mathews Swindler, Medical Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Frank Coffin Holbrook, Field Artillery (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 30, 1936.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Capt. Everett Clifton Hayden, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from June 13, 1939.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. John Barkley Pattison, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 14, 1941.

Second Lt. George Major White, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from July 1, 1940.

Second Lt. William Jonreau Williams II, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from July 1, 1940.

Second Lt. John Edward Nitsche, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from July 1, 1940.

Second Lt. Alfred George Hayduk, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30, 1942:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Thomas J. Millican, Brilliant.
Willard D. Leake, Jasper.
Samuel D. Wren, Red Bay.

FLORIDA

Jefferson Gaines, Boca Grande.
Paul E. Mahan, Hobe Sound.

LOUISIANA

Laverna O. Ramsey, Pleasant Hill.

MISSISSIPPI

Walter Darracott, Aberdeen.
Bonnie H. Curd, Pace.
Thelma Z. Landry, Waveland.

NEW JERSEY

Marie H. Pill, Califon.
Peter J. Egan, Montclair.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mary P. Mishoe, Greelyville.
Lindsay C. McFadden, Rock Hill.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Robert L. Ghormley to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Herman Hansen, Jr.
Joe B. Russell
Richard L. Boll
Lucien W. Carmichael
Walter W. Hitesman, Jr.
John L. Hopkins
James G. Kelly
Charles D. Harris
George O. Ludcke, Jr.
Donald R. Kennedy

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Alcuin Heibel, O. S. B., Mount Angel College, Mount Angel, Oreg., offered the following prayer:

O Heavenly Father, acknowledging ourselves Thy creatures, we ask the continued blessings of your kind providence upon our Nation. We are grateful to be citizens of these United States. Guide our President, enlighten the minds of our legislators in their deliberations so that they may conclude unselfishly and wisely during these critical times in our Nation's history.

Grant, O Lord, that we may always have the decency to revere Thy holy name and to respect the dignity of a human person. May we keep our Government so arranged that it may always benefit and protect all the people, not as classes or antagonistic groups, but as one family in the peace of Christ. Give to all of us, and especially to our chosen leaders, the grace to realize and always remember the essential unit of our American society in the family in which parents are acknowledged as the representatives of God with the natural right and duty to take a guiding part in the education of their children. O Divine Master, in this world cursed by the selfish ambitions of proud individuals, by the international hatreds born of human greed, let us recall Thy lessons in justice, charity, and tolerance. Grant that our American religious, social, and economic life may always be based on the 10-point moral code of God's Commandments, for only thus can our American liberties and responsibilities be preserved in their original purity and intent.

Please, God, help us all to keep America American in its finest aspirations and highest ideals. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2404. An act to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the Legion of Merit, and the Medal for Merit.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. Civil Service Commission.